00111634

BOMBAY BRANCH
OF THE
ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY.
TOWN HALL, BOMBAY.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 19 September, 2016

THE

FIRST AGE OF THE CHURCH.

This Translation is Published with the Author's Exclusive Approbation.

THE FIRST AGE OF CHRISTIANITY

AND

THE CHURCH.

111634

BY

JOHN IGNATIUS DÖLLINGER, D.D.,

PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF MUNICH;
PROVOST OF THE CHAPEL ROYAL AND THEATINE CHURCH, ETC.

TRANSLATED BY

HENRY NUTCOMBE OXENHAM, M.A.,

LATE SCHOLAR OF BALLIOL COLLEGE, OXFORD.

"Attendite ad petram unde excisi estis, et ad cavernam laci de quâ præcisi estis."

VOL. I.

D. b. 47.

LONDON:
WM. H. ALLEN & CO., 13, WATERLOO PLACE, S.W.
1866.

00111634

LEWIS AND SON, SWAN BUILDINGS, MOORGATE STREET.

TO

THE VERY REVEREND

JOHN HENRY NEWMAN, D.D.,

WHOSE ILLUSTRIOUS NAME

IS ALONE

A PASSPORT TO THE HEARTS

AND

A SECURE CLAIM ON THE INTELLECTUAL RESPECT

OF HIS COUNTRYMEN

BOTH WITHIN AND WITHOUT THE CHURCH,

THIS TRANSLATION

OF A WORK

BY THE GREAT CATHOLIC DIVINE OF THE CONTINENT,

IS, BY HIS PERMISSION,

DEDICATED.

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE.

No apology can be needed for introducing to English readers what is considered by competent judges one of the ablest and most instructive works of the first divine and Ecclesiastical historian of Catholic Germany. The words used in 1840, in the Preface to his Translation of an earlier work of Dr. Döllinger's, by the late Dr. Cox, President of St. Edmund's College, Herts—who has the high credit of having called the attention of his countrymen to the rich stores of German theological literature, at a period when such knowledge was far less common, both among Catholics and Protestants, even than it is now,—may well be repeated here, when their truth has been so abundantly illustrated by the superadded testimony of twenty-six intervening years. "The name of the learned Professor, the author of this history, may stand as its only, its sufficient recommendation. The works already published by Dr. Döllinger, in the cause of literature and religion, have spread his fame widely through the nations of Europe." * If his name was a sufficient recommendation then, it is more than sufficient now.

But a few words will be in place, to explain the main scope and design of the present work. It is, properly speaking, a sequel to the Author's *Heidenthum und Judenthum*—of which an admirable and scholarly Translation appeared four years ago, from the pen of the Rev.

* Preface to Cox's *Translation of Döllinger's History of the Church.* (Dolman, 1840.)

N. Darnell, late Fellow of New College, Oxford*—and a first instalment of what, if life and health be spared him, will be a complete Ecclesiastical History, destined to supersede the earlier and less matured work already referred to. It must be remembered, however, that the Apostolic age, while it forms, so to say, the first chapter in the life of the Catholic Church, is in many respects an exceptional period, standing alone and isolated from all later epochs of Christian History. It is no mere portion, however integral, of the edifice of that new Society which Christ set up on earth, but the foundation of the entire building. It is, therefore, a period capable of separate treatment; and the description of it may be viewed as a whole in itself, not, indeed, as having no relation to the later history, but as containing the fundamental axioms for its right interpretation. To use the Author's words, in another work; "The Catholic theologian cannot but regard the whole course of the Church in the light of a grand process of development, a continual growth from within, not the growth of a tape-worm, but of a tree, into which the mustard seed of the Apostolic age has expanded. He cannot arbitrarily choose a period here or there, and content himself with studying that, but must investigate the Church in the entirety of her outward life and historical continuity from the beginning until now, and do his best to exhibit it adequately to others; and this is the work of a lifetime." † We are to examine in the present treatise the sources of this development, the seed from which the tree has grown.

1. Among its peculiar excellences not the least is, that the Author has described the Apostolic age, as far as possible, from the stand-point of a contemporary observer, and by the light of contemporary documents;

* *The Gentile and the Jew in the Courts of the Temple.* (Longman. 1862).

† *Rede über Vergangenheit und Gegenwart der kathol. Theologie.* p. 24.

excluding all reference to the traditions or usages, still more to the prepossessions, of a later period. The Church of the Apostles is the Church of the New Testament; and he accordingly traces in the Apostolic writings the moral and dogmatic aspects of Apostolic Christianity. The Second Book, which is concerned with doctrine, consists chiefly of a comment on those writings. The truths presented to our notice are, indeed, substantially identical with those we are familiar with in the creeds and definitions of the Church from Nicæa to Trent; but they come before us here, not in their ultimate development, which was the growth of centuries, and in that technical and systematic shape which the pressure of heresy ultimately compelled them to assume, but in the freshness of their first utterance, as they fell from the lips of Apostles and Evangelists, and in the devotional or hortatory form natural to Epistles addressed, for the most part, to particular individuals or communities, and called forth by special exigencies of time or place. To take one instance; the doctrine of Justification, of which our Author gives a full and luminous exposition, is handled at length in several of St. Paul's Epistles, especially in the Epistle to the Romans, and the Tridentine definitions explain and summarise his teaching. Here, it is put before us, not in the words of the Tridentine formula, but as gathered from the fuller, though, at first sight, less explicit, statements scattered through the writings of the great Apostle himself. We are thus reminded of the fundamental harmony between the language of Scripture and of Theology, and of those needs and capabilities of the human mind which are the ground and justification, within certain limits, of doctrinal development in the Church; "the text of Scripture being addressed principally to the affections, and though definite according to the criterion of practical inference, vague and incomplete in the judgment of the intellect." *

* Newman's *Arians of the Fourth Century*. p. 161.

2. Dr. Döllinger has not thrown this work into a controversial shape, but it has none the less obviously its bearings on Strauss's estimate of the Life of Christ* —lately re-published by the Author with little material alteration—and still more on Baur's conception of the history and doctrinal position of the Apostolic Church. Indeed, the favourite theory of the Tübingen school, of a threefold division of Apostolic Christianity, ranging itself under the rival banners of the three leading Apostles, St. Peter, St. Paul and St. John, is more than once directly animadverted upon; while those familiar with the destructive criticism of Germany—which has incidentally rendered important services to the cause of Truth †—will often recognise a special meaning in passages where it is not expressly named. Recent legislation in this country will have invested the discussion, in the Third Book and the final Appendix, on the Scriptural doctrine of Marriage and Divorce with peculiar interest for many English readers. And if there are any besides Dr. Cumming who still retain a lingering respect for the Protestant tradition about Antichrist and the "Man of Sin," they will find in the first Appendix an exhaustive account of its origin and growth.

3. A further remark, of more general application to Dr. Döllinger's writings, will probably suggest itself to the reader. While he is a strenuous upholder of the Catholic and dogmatic principle, his manner of explaining and recommending it differs in some important respects from

* Rénan's *Vie de Jésus*, which has evidently exerted an important influence on the composition of a remarkable book lately published in this country, *Ecce Homo* (Macmillan, 1866), did not appear till after the publication of the present work.

† It is a remarkable circumstance that, for some years past, the most distinguished Faculty of Catholic Theology in Germany has been that of Tübingen, where Möhler was reared and remained as theological Professor till 1835, and where he published, in 1832, his most important work, the *Symbolik*. Dr. Kühn, the present occupant of his Chair, is regarded as *facilé secundus* among German Catholic divines

what is not unfrequently in the present day, to our great misfortune, treated by friend and foe alike, as the only legitimate or intelligible championship of orthodoxy. There is no need to enter on a detailed examination of those differences here, and it would be a mere impertinence to defend them.* But the fact deserves a passing recognition, when among those who claim to be the spokesmen and apologists of Catholicism in modern Europe there are not a few who seem to regard as little better than heretics or infidels, men (such as Döllinger and Rosmini) who have dedicated their highest intellectual energies and the toils of a lifetime to the service of the Church of God, but who shrink instinctively from a method of serving her cause which appears to them the most fatal, because least intentional, contribution to the progress of unbelief. No reader, of whatever school of thought or however widely he may dissent from the Author's views, need fear to encounter in Dr. Döllinger a narrow dogmatist, or an adroit special pleader, or a fierce and indiscriminate partizan. If, on the one hand, he regards it as "the mark of a true theologian to dig deep, to examine with restless assiduity, and not to draw back in terror, should his investigation lead to conclusions that are unwelcome or inconsistent with preconceived notions or favourite views;" he would certainly be the last to claim for himself any infallibility, in forgetfulness of his own emphatic statement that "it is a law, as valid for the future as for the past, that in theology we can only through mistakes attain to truth."† Few, indeed, have known so well as himself how to act in the spirit of his own memorable advice at the closing of the Munich Congress of 1863; "to make a firm resolution for the future, to use none but scientific weapons in philosophical and theological inquiries; to banish from literature, as un-German [let

* The reader may be referred to the Speech delivered before the Munich Congress, from which my last extract was taken.

† *Verhandl. der Versammlung kathol. Gelehrt. in München*, pp. 50, 58.

us add un-English] and un-Catholic, all denunciation and holding up to suspicion of those who differ from us, and rather to take for our model in dealing with them the grave and truly Evangelical gentleness of Augustine and the enlightened teachers of the ancient Church." *

To speak now of the Translation;—it has been my aim throughout to present an idiomatic rendering of the exact *sense*, not always necessarily the exact words of the original. The following admirable remarks by one of the greatest living masters of the English language may be fitly quoted here, not in deprecation of criticism, but in explanation of the method pursued, and in extenuation of defects more or less incidental to a task the difficulty of which has been so keenly felt by a writer who has so successfully surmounted it. "It should be considered that translation in itself is, after all, but a problem, how, two languages being given, the nearest approximation may be made in the second to the expression of ideas already conveyed through the medium of the first. The problem almost starts with the assumption that something must be sacrificed, and the chief question is, what is the least sacrifice? . . . . Under these circumstances, perhaps, it is fair to lay down that, while every care must be taken against the introduction of new, or the omission of existing ideas in the original text, yet in a book intended for general reading faithfulness may be held simply to consist in expressing in English the *sense* of the original, the actual words of the latter being viewed as *directions into* its meaning, and scholarship being necessary in order to gain the full insight which they afford; and next, that where something must be sacrificed, precision or intelligibility, it is better in a popular work to be understood by those who are not critics than to be applauded by those who are." † In describing what he has himself, in fact, attained, Dr.

* *Verhandl. der Versammlung kathol. Gelehrt. in München*, p. 133.
† Preface to *Church of the Fathers*, pp. 8, 9.

Newman has described what I have aimed at. I have always tried to keep in mind what appears to me the true idea of a translation—that it should read like an original composition, so far as is consistent with fidelity to the sense of the text. How inadequately that standard has been realised here, I am well aware; and it is only right to add that the fault, where I have failed, is not my Author's but my own. Those who are acquainted with Dr. Döllinger's writings will have observed how markedly the clear and luminous simplicity of his style contrasts with the long and involved sentences often so perplexing to us in German writers, the more so as their obscurity of language seems not unfrequently to spring from obscurity of thought. In this respect the two great leaders, on the Christian and the infidel side, Döllinger and Strauss, stand pre-eminently distinguished from the majority of their countrymen.

I need scarcely observe, what is obvious, that the office of a translator is to translate, not to criticise. The few notes I have added of my own are simply designed to explain or illustrate the text, and occasionally to point out a difference between high authorities on some question of fact. In one or two instances, where the sense assigned to a word or passage in the Greek Testament seemed doubtful, I have added a literal translation at the bottom of the page. I have also ventured, for the greater convenience of my readers, to break up each of the three books into chapters; and have re-arranged, and considerably enlarged, the Table of Contents. The quotations from Scripture are not taken ordinarily from any English version with which the reader, Catholic or Protestant, may be familiar; Old Testament passages are translated from the Vulgate, New Testament passages from the Greek text, regard being had in doubtful cases to the rendering of the Vulgate. As a general rule, however, the Author does not quote Scripture but paraphrases it; and even in quotations he does not always follow the precise wording of the original. Where the nomen-

clature or arrangement of the Vulgate differs from that of the English "Authorised Version" (as in the Psalter) a reference to the latter is added in brackets, for the convenience of those who use it.

It only remains to add, that the Author's kindness has enabled me to insert the corrections introduced into the Second Edition, now preparing for publication in Germany, so far as it is already in type.

To the Translator himself it has been a privilege thus to sit, as it were, for awhile at the feet of so great and good a man. And, should the appearance of this work in an English dress lead any of our countrymen hitherto unacquainted with Dr. Döllinger's writings to study them, or any who know something of them already to seek to know more; and thus contribute, in an age of bitterness and contradiction, to make the influence of his calm, fearless wisdom, truth-loving spirit, and large-hearted charity more widely felt, the time and labour expended on the work of translation for the benefit of others will not have been spent in vain.

H. N. O.

Feast of St. Gregory the Great, 1866.

AUTHOR'S PREFACE.

This work deals with the history of a period of only seventy years, and indeed with one event and institution only, which to far the greater number of those living at the time either remained unknown or seemed much too insignificant for it to be worth their while to trouble themselves further about the matter. Yet this mere span of time is the most important in the history of mankind. The foundation of the Christian Church closes a preparation and development of many thousand years, and is the starting point of a new order in the world. The world before Christ, and the world after Christ—that is, and ever must be, the simplest and truest division of history.

It is but the beginnings and simple form of the original Apostolic Church, self-contained like a seed-corn, and hiding its inner reality from strangers, that we are here concerned with. But these beginnings contain the powers and secrets of a culture which, embracing the whole of humanity in its universal scope, is still, after eighteen centuries, ever receiving new life and in constant growth; there is laid up in them a wealth of creative ideas, a fulness of new forms in Church, in State, in Art, in Knowledge and in Manners, which are far, indeed, from being exhausted; nay, more, which in time to come will bring to light developments in knowledge and in life that as yet we can scarcely conjecture.

The sharpest and most concentrated gaze of the naturalist who opens and dissects a seed-corn cannot discern the forms potentially and substantially contained in it, or suggest what it will grow into. And just so, the acutest Greek or Roman, had he scrutinised ever so carefully and impartially the young Christian communities at his side, would either have refused to predict anything of their future progress and place in history, or would have given an entirely wrong account of what actually followed, not to say exactly the reverse of the true one. Nor only so; Christians themselves were very far from appreciating the reach, and the force for the world's culture of those spiritual and moral powers laid up in the bosom of their society, and entrusted to their care and administration. On the other hand, nearly two thousand years of Christian history are spread before our eyes; we are in a position to embrace and measure the process of development working itself out by an internal law of necessary sequence, a continually advancing and constructive process never, indeed, transcending the original fulness of its internal being, but far surpassing the simple outlines and primitive forms of thought and life in the Apostolic age. In the light of this long experience, where every age is a commentary to illustrate the preceding one, we can pierce more deeply into the spirit of the Apostolic Church, and exhibit all its bearings more fully than former generations could. The reader, then, will easily comprehend the scope and nature of the present work, as it floated before the Author's mind; he readily admits that it has not been adequately realised here.

CONTENTS TO VOL. I.

BOOK I.—CHRIST AND THE APOSTLES.

CHAP. I.—MINISTRY AND TEACHING OF CHRIST.

	PAGE
St. John Baptist the Precursor of Christ	1
Early Life and Baptism of Christ	2
His Answer to the Messengers of the Baptist	5
His first Disciples	7
First Cleansing of Temple	8
Conversation with Nicodemus	9
Conversation with Samaritan Woman	10
His Ministry in Galilee	11
Call of the Apostles	14
His Relation to the Jews and their Authorities	15
Relation to His own Followers	17
His Miracles	19
His Prophecies	22
His Teaching—On the Fatherhood of God	23
On His own Person as God and Man	23
His Example	27
His Teaching—On Sin and Satan	28
On Redemption	29
On Faith and Repentance	31
On Love, True Righteousness, and Fulfilling the Law	31

PAGE

His Teaching—On the Church, or Kingdom of God . . . 36
On the Primacy of Peter 41
On the Plenary Powers of the Apostles . . 44
On the Mixture of Good and Evil in the Church . 46
The Tranfiguration 47
Raising of Lazarus, Entry into Jerusalem, and Second Cleansing of Temple 48
The Last Supper, and Institution of the Eucharist . . . 50
The Agony, Trial, and Crucifixion 54
The Resurrection and Ascension 57

CHAP. II.—ST. PETER AND ST. PAUL.

The First Disciples and Election of St. Matthias . . . 60
Descent of Holy Ghost at Pentecost 61
St. Peter—His Preaching at Jerusalem and Imprisonment . . 63
Appointment of Seven Deacons. St. Stephen and St. Philip 67
His Preaching at Samaria, and Conversion of Cornelius 70
Founding of Gentile Church at Antioch . . . 73
St. Paul—His Conversion 74
Journeys to Arabia and Jerusalem 77
Divine Call to Gentile Apostolate 80
The Dispute about the Jewish Law . . . 83
The Council of Jerusalem 86
St. Peter and St. Paul at Antioch 89
St. Paul's Journeys and Epistles (1 and 2 Thess. Gal. 1, 2, Cor. Rom.), till his first Imprisonment at Rome 93
His Epistles written in Prison (Col. Eph. Philem. Philipp.) 111
His Liberation, Pastoral Epistles, and Second Imprisonment 113

PAGE
The Epistle to the Hebrews 119
St. Paul's Character and Labours 123
His Relation to the other Apostles 130
St. Peter's Epistles 133
His Relation to Roman Church 136
Martyrdom of St. Peter and St. Paul at Rome . . 143
Burning of Rome and Neronian Persecution . . . 144

CHAP. III.—ST. JAMES, ST. JUDE, ST. JOHN, AND THE REMAINING APOSTLES.

St. James—Son of Alphæus, the Lord's Brother, and Bishop of Jerusalem 147
His Ascetic Life and his Death 150
His Epistle 153
St. Jude, and his Epistle 155
Destruction of Jerusalem, and Consequences to the Church . . 156
St. John, Apostle and Evangelist 160
His Epistles 162
The Apocalypse 164
The Beginnings of Heresy combated in Apostolic Writings . . 178
The Synoptic Gospels and Acts of the Apostles 186
St. John's Gospel, and its Relation to the Synoptics . . . 191
Gospel of the Hebrews, and its Relation to St. Matthew's . . 196
The Remaining Apostles and Evangelists 197

BOOK II.—DOCTRINE OF THE APOSTLES.

CHAP. I.—SCRIPTURE AND TRADITION.

Scripture—Occasion and Object of the Apostolic Writings . . 201
Fragmentary Nature of their Doctrinal Contents . 203
Individual Character, and Greek Language . . 206
Use of Old Testament in New Testament . . . 208

PAGE

Scripture—Septuagint Version used 213
Uncanonical Writings used 216
Canon and Inspiration of New Testament . . 217
Tradition—Anterior to Scripture 219
Jewish Tradition passed into Christian Church . 220
Relation of Tradition and Scripture to Christian Belief 223
First Fixing of Tradition 226
Development and Continuity of Doctrine . . . 228

CHAP. II.—THE TRINITY, INCARNATION, AND REDEMPTION.

Divinity of Christ. The Logos of St. John (and of Philo) . . 233
The Holy Ghost and His Work 238
The Holy Trinity 241
The Kingdom of Angels and of Fallen Spirits 242
The Incarnation, Atonement, and Redemption 247
Sin and the Law, Justification and Sanctification . . . 253
The Offer of Salvation universal, Election and Reprobation . 296

FIRST BOOK.

CHRIST AND THE APOSTLES.

CHAPTER I.

THE PUBLIC MINISTRY AND TEACHING OF CHRIST.

THE Jewish kingdom united under Herod was again broken up at his death, and in 779, A.U.C., the procurator, Pontius Pilate, ruled in what had become the Roman province of Judea. The emperor was a voluntary exile in Capreæ, where he disgraced his old age by the most shameful vices, while his favourite Sejanus made the trembling inhabitants of the capital feel how powerless and defenceless they were against the new imperial power now turned into a murderous despotism. At this time there appeared in the remotest and south-eastern-most corner of the empire, in that desolate region which stretches westwards from the Dead Sea to the mouth of the Jordan, a preacher of repentance, John, the son of the Jewish priest Zachariah.[1]

[1] Luke iii. 1 sqq.

In him was renewed the old race of Prophets—extinguished for centuries—of whom he was the last and greatest. It was his office to proclaim what none of the earlier prophets could, that the Promised One and His kingdom were close at hand, and to prepare the way before Him. John was to be the last and immediate messenger of the new kingdom of faith, and the herald of its Founder, who was already on earth, but as yet hidden and unknown.

On him rested the zeal and the avenging fiery spirit of Elias. He denounced in the sharpest words the ruling sins of the ruling classes; nay, the whole nation seemed to him unclean, and unworthy the high destiny now awaiting it. He announced not only the setting up of Messiah's kingdom, but that a separation and a great judgment was to accompany His appearance.[1]

For six months he worked on the people by his preaching, before calling them to be baptized in the Jordan. This baptism was an outward and prophetic one. John baptized with water only; He, of whom he spoke, was first to bring in a baptism with the Spirit and with fire, bestowing higher powers.[2] For the present, men were to testify by laying aside their clothes at the water baptism their willingness to put off the old man, and by their immersion their willingness to be cleansed from moral defilement.

John waited, baptizing at the Jordan, for Him whom

[1] Matt. xi. 14; iii. 7 sqq. Luke i. 17; iii. 7 sqq.
[2] Matt. iii. 11. John i. 26, 33.

he preached, but as yet knew not. For he had been promised a miraculous sign from heaven to point out Him for whom he was looking.[1] A youth approached him in whom he recognised a near relative on the mother's side. This young man, Jesus, was the son of a poor woman who lived in the little Galilean town of Nazareth, and the secret of His fatherless conception had not got beyond the walls of the house at Nazareth; before the world He passed for the son of the carpenter, who had married His mother. He had first seen the light of day in a stall at Bethlehem, and a manger had been His cradle. His foster-father and His mother had fled with the Child into Egypt from the murderous attack of Herod. On His return from thence He had been brought up to His foster-father's trade, and had lived, as the "carpenter" at Nazareth, quiet and unobserved; only once, as a Boy twelve years old, when He accompanied His parents to Jerusalem at the festival, He had attracted passing notice by His premature knowledge of the Scriptures. But that had been long forgotten; His immediate neighbourhood had perceived nothing remarkable in Him; so far from it that, when He afterwards began to teach in public, His relations thought Him mad, and wished to lay hands on His person.[2]

John felt an immediate presentiment that this and no other was the object of universal desire, the long expected Messiah, that Greater One, whose shoe latchet, as he had already said, he himself was not worthy to unloose. He knew that this Youth had no need of his baptism, the baptism of repentance; that he, the

[1] John i. 33. [2] Mark iii. 21.

unclean, had nothing to offer to the Holy One. He drew back and said, "It is I that have need of Thy baptism, and comest Thou to receive of me this token of sin and repentance?" But the Son of Mary insisted on being baptised by him, "for so it becomes us," He said, "to fulfil all righteousness." It was right, that is to say, for Him to put the seal on the divine mission of His forerunner, and the sacred institution of the baptism he administered, by Himself receiving it; it was right, too, for Him, whose office it was become to bear the burden of His people, that He should submit, as a son of that people, to the token of national guilt and defilement. Moreover, this baptism had in Him the meaning of a vow for the future, to lead a life entirely devoted to fulfilling the will of God.

His voluntary abasement was turned into an occasion of glory for Him—to John it was the promised sign by which he recognised the Messiah. Both of them at the baptism heard the voice from heaven, "This is My beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased;" both saw the heavens opened, and the dove descend, and rest upon Jesus.[1] Thus the baptism, and what accompanied it, were the initiation of Christ to His Messianic office. He had received His consecration as King, Prophet, and High Priest of the new kingdom through this baptism, and the over-shadowing of the Holy Ghost, as under the old law the high priests were consecrated by washing with water and the unction poured on their head.[2]

John looked much further and deeper than the mass

[1] Matt. iii. 13 sqq. Mark i. 9—11. Luke iii. 21—23. John i. 32.
[2] Exod. xxix. 4, 7.

of the people to whom the idea of a suffering, self-sacrificing Messiah was then a strange one, and had already pointed out Christ to his disciples as the Lamb devoted to God and destined to offer Himself for the sins of the whole world. He had already declared to the messengers of the Sanhedrim, the highest spiritual tribunal, when questioned about his office and credentials, that not he but another already standing among them was the Messiah, and by this he brought Christ His first disciples. Though he still continued to baptize, his office closed, properly speaking, with the baptism of Jesus. He said that Christ's influence must increase while his own decreased.[1]

Herod Antipas tetrarch of Galilee had at first paid some attention to the severe preacher of repentance who held up his sins as in a mirror before him, but when John denounced his incestuous connection with Herodias, his own niece and his brother's wife, he imprisoned the prophet in the castle of Machar, partly to protect him from Herodias's anger, partly fearing his influence over an excitable people.[2]

The news of the attitude and works of Christ which reached the Baptist in prison, roused his suspicions. One who worked so many miraculous cures seemed to him more like one of the prophets and a herald of the coming kingdom than introducing it as himself its king. He had not expected this reserved and unobtrusive line, but rather an immediate display of

[1] John i., 19—29; iii. 30.

[2] Matt. xiv. 1 sqq.; Mark vi. 14—29; Luke iii. 19, 20.

Messianic dignity and judicial power, such as he had himself threatened the terrified Jews with as close at hand. He therefore sent two of his disciples to Jesus to ask, "Art thou the Messiah that was to come, or must we wait for another?" This question clearly implied the wish and expectation that, on being thus pressed, Jesus would openly assume his Messianic title and office, for the consolation of all eagerly looking for the moment.

The messengers found Him surrounded by those miraculously healed, and He referred them to His works; they were to tell their Master what they had seen and heard, how by Christ's power the blind saw, the lame walked, the deaf heard, the lepers were cleansed, the dead raised, the poor—whether spiritually or from bodily want—had the Gospel preached to them. John could not but remember that this fulfilled the Messianic promises of the old Prophets; and thus his question received the most emphatic reply.[1]

Christ was led to give a solemn attestation to the dignity and greatness of John before the people, from observing that, though they had eagerly sought him out as a prophet, they now esteemed him lightly when in prison, and made small account of his person, his mission, and his words. He therefore declared John the greatest among the prophets or those born of women, and more than a prophet, for he had proclaimed what they could not—the actual presence of the promised One and the kingdom of God. He knew more of the Mes-

[1] Isa. xxxv. 4—6, xvi. 1; Matt. xi. 1—6; Luke vii. 18—23.

siah, and had drawn a fuller and clearer picture of Him, than the old Prophets and the whole people after them.[1]

Christ had found His first disciples among the followers of John. By John's testimony Andrew and another—by whom the fourth Evangelist means himself—had joined him. Andrew brought his brother Simon, in whom Jesus recognised at the first glance that type of character which specially fitted him to become the rock of the church, and He therefore gave him the prophetic name of Rock, Peter or Cephas. On the way towards Galilee, a fourth, named Philip, was called by Jesus to follow Him, coming, like Andrew and Simon, from Bethsaida. Then came Nathanael or Bartholomew, who, when Philip first told him that he had found the true Messiah in the carpenter's son of Nazareth, inquired doubtfully if any good could come out of a town so ill-reputed of as Nazareth? But his doubt vanished when Jesus showed knowledge of an important moment in his life which he thought only known to himself. Jesus promised him and the rest that they should see greater things than these; in His school and service they would be allowed to gaze into the open heavens, the depth of the divine counsels; they would witness His constant intercourse with God, as it were through angels ascending and descending upon Him, and those higher powers which He had brought with Him as a heavenly gift to the earth. Of those powers he gave the first proof at the marriage feast in Cana of Galilee, which He attended with His mother and disciples, by turning water into wine.[2]

[1] Matt. xi. 7 sqq.

[2] John i. 35—51; ii. 1 sqq.

During His stay in Judea, when He went with His disciples to Jerusalem for the Passover of 780, A.U.C., Jesus performed an act, which in itself any zealot for the law might have undertaken, but which in Him was a proclamation at once of His high dignity and His Messiahship;—He cleansed His Father's house, using His right as the Son of Him whose the temple was to drive out the buyers and sellers. He thus declared Himself to be the promised Messiah, who should reform and cleanse the temple. It was not from men recognising His dignity and claim that He was not opposed, but from surprise at the suddenness and boldness of the procedure, and still more from something about His presence, which overawed them, as when afterwards the majesty of His nature broke forth from its accustomed veil, it disarmed the soldiers sent to seize Him, and cast them to the ground.[1]

This act was a reflection on the priesthood who had before favoured this disorder in the temple, and thus, while it reminded the disciples of that devouring zeal for the House of God spoken of in the Messianic psalm, the Pharisees required Him to justify it by a miracle, showing Him to be either a prophet divinely commissioned, or the Messiah. He replied, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up again," referring to His own body as the true temple, where the Godhead dwelt, and thus giving the sign at once of a double prophecy, of His death and resurrection. But they, who of course could not understand His meaning,

[1] John ii. 14 sqq.; vii. 46; xviii. 6; Mal. iii. 1—3.

asked contemptuously whether He would rear in three days an edifice which took forty-six years to build?[1]

The frequent cures which Christ then wrought in Jerusalem led to a belief in many that He was either a true prophet, or the expected Messiah himself; but He saw through the untrustworthiness of this merely external half-belief produced by miracles, and confided neither His person nor His secret doctrine to such men, knowing that those who had a deeper and more living faith would follow after Him, and never rest till received among His disciples. . Nicodemus, a member of the Sanhedrim, came to visit Him by night, in order to gain a deeper insight into His mission and real teaching. This interview, in which Nicodemus wanted to ascertain whether Jesus was the Messiah, showed how hard it was for a Pharisee, influenced by the Jewish notions then prevalent, even to understand the great truths on which His teaching was based.

Jesus declared to the astonished Jewish Rabbi, "No mortal has yet ascended into heaven to search out the counsels of God; I alone was there, though appearing now as Son of Man; from thence I came down upon earth to be a man among men, and as the surest evidence of it I proclaim to them what I there saw, the divine plan of salvation. Though now on earth in human form, I am in abiding communion with God, and have also a more than earthly being. In his pitying love for man God has sent Me, His Only-Begotten, to be lifted up as a public spectacle on the gibbet, and become

[1] Ps. lxviii. 10 (lxix. 9, E. v.). John ii. 18—20.

a source of redemption to all who rely in faith on this divine means of healing, as of old the brazen serpent was lifted up in the wilderness, that those bitten of serpents might look on it in faith and be healed.[1] From My death flows the power of that baptism of water and the Spirit whereby men shall be born again to a new life, and received into the kingdom of God I am come to found."

When Jesus saw that his influence with the people had drawn on Him the suspicious watchfulness of the Pharisee party, He resolved, late in the autumn of 780, to withdraw into Galilee, where He would be less exposed to their observation and the snares they laid for Him. His way led through Samaria, which the strict zealots of the Law used to avoid, out of hatred for the Samaritans, by taking a circuitous route through Persia. At Sichem he got into conversation with a Samaritan woman, and, while maintaining the just claim of the Jewish worship against the arbitrarily devised Samaritan rite, took occasion to point out the temporary character of both forms, and the speedy introduction of a new and no longer local worship in their stead. "You Samaritans," he said, "honour God by sacrifices you have invented or adopted for yourselves, but which, for you who reject the Prophets and the whole course of that increasing revelation which points entirely to the Messiah, have no force or inward meaning. But we in Judæa, from whom comes salvation by the Messiah, celebrate the typical sacrifices of the Law on Sion. This quarrel, however, between Gerizim

[1] Numb. xxi. 9.

and Sion will soon have an end, for the time is come when the true worshippers of God will serve Him, not with the legal and typical ceremonies belonging to this or that place or temple, not with the blood of goats and lambs, but with a sacrifice suited to the spiritual nature of God, itself spirit and truth, and accompanied by the purely spiritual acts of prayer, adoration, love, and hope,—the one mystical unbloody sacrifice of the New Covenant, to be offered everywhere throughout the whole extent of the Church.[1]

Thus Jesus did in Samaria what He had not yet done in Jerusalem or Judea or Galilee; He told the woman plainly that He was the Messiah, and having sent for the inhabitants of Sichem devoted two days to confirming their belief in Him. This He could do safely among a people with whom the Jews held no intercourse, where no Scribes and Pharisees were spies on Him, and where there was no fear lest a recognition of His claims should kindle an insurrection against the Roman Government.

From Samaria He went into Galilee, and was better received there than before, for the Galileans returned from Jerusalem had already spread the fame of His deeds and teaching. Thenceforward he spent great part of His public life in this fertile and populous region. In Jerusalem and Judea a hostile feeling against Him had already grown up among the influential classes and leaders of the people, and especially since He healed a sick man on the Sabbath during the Feast of Taber-

[1] John iv. 1. sqq.

nacles, and defended Himself as being the Son of God, they had sought after his life as a Sabbath-breaker and blasphemer. He, therefore, preferred to live and work in Galilee rather than where the Pharisees and lawyers were strongest. There he dwelt among Gentiles in that part of Israel most slighted and abandoned to itself. It was a saying of the Pharisees that no prophet could come out of Galilee. But as He wished to fulfil all righteousnesss as a Jew, and show Himself a true and strictly conscientious son of His nation, He always came for a short time to Jerusalem on the high festivals.[1]

He fixed His abode in the little town of Capernaum, separating Himself finally from His family in the distant Nazareth, and thence made His journeys, passing gradually through all Galilee, and teaching everywhere in the synagogues. But the neighbourhood of the Sea of Tiberias was His most frequent resort. He avoided the more important towns, such as Tiberias, where Herod the tetrarch lived, Sephoris, Gadara and the fortified Giskala, only teaching and working in the smaller towns and villages, true to His plan of not courting danger before the time, and avoiding an uproar which would be sooner excited among the masses in the larger towns. He shunned the interior of the country where the really Jewish population was, seeking rather the frontier mountains and remote regions, partly for undisturbed prayer, partly to avoid a populace craving for miracles and a political Messiah, who at one time wanted to pro-

[1] John iv. 43 sqq.; v. 1—18; vii 52.

claim Him king, while at another—so sudden was their revulsion of feeling—they were ready to surrender Him as a criminal.[1]

His public ministry lasted two years and some months. Certain women, partly relatives, accompanied Him on His journeys besides the Twelve. The larger body of seventy disciples seem only now and then to have been with Him, and at other times despatched on the business He gave them. Out of loving condescension to the capacities of the poor in spirit and spiritual infants, He clothed his teaching in proverbs, and parables, and examples drawn from nature and human life. He used the Old Testament and appealed to prevalent popular belief, but He handled the sacred books as a Lord and Master who had learnt from no human teacher, and received the impress of no school or party, but who was exalted above such limitations, and brought to those books a light and clearness derived from His own higher wisdom. He showed Himself fully and in all respects a true and genuine member of the Jewish nation and Church. As He received in childhood the national covenant sign of circumcision, so from the opening of His public ministry He observed the ritual law. He kept the Sabbath, though refusing to be bound by the later glosses put upon the rule. In the Sermon on the Mount He insisted on a stricter righteousness in observing the moral law than was found in the letter of the commandment or the prevalent opinions and practice of the Jews, but the works of this law were to grow

[1] Matt. iv. 13.; John vi. 15.

spontaneously, like the fruits of a good tree, out of the pure root of a sanctified will wholly given up to God. The righteousness of His kingdom was to be the reverse of that dark, self-pleasing, often hypocritical righteousness of works which He denounced so sharply in the Pharisees. Full well did He foresee that the majority of His people at last would reject Him and His teaching. They took offence at His humble birth, His intercourse with publicans and sinners, and His not sharing the common hatred of the Roman Government and desire to get rid of it. The Scribes and Pharisees saw in Him a dangerous rival who would injure their credit and influence with the people. His whole life was such that He could challenge even His enemies to accuse Him of one sin or error. The spies and watchers who at last followed Him everywhere, could discover nothing which cast the slightest shadow on Him. But He taught and worked from the first with the full consciousness that He was rousing or augmenting the hatred of men, and that He must give up His life as a sacrifice to it.[1]

He announced during His first journeys that the kingdom of heaven was at hand, and His work on earth was to found it. He now first called to a lifelong and undivided activity in his service those four fishermen who had previously joined him, Andrew and Simon, John and James. Thomas and Nathanael now again joined Him. From the crowd of disciples and adherents who gradually collected round Him Jesus chose out an inner circle of men with whom to hold a more con-

[1] Matt. xiii. 55.; ix. 11. John viii. 46.

fidential intercourse, and who should form, as it were, His own family. These Twelve, all of them Galilean fishermen, peasants, and publicans, were to be the foundation stones of His future Church, the twelve patriarchs of the new Israel corresponding to the twelve tribes. He had prepared for the great work of choosing them by a night of solitary prayer.[1] He named them Apostles, that is—Sent. Six of them had attended Him from the beginning of His ministry, the brothers Peter and Andrew, James and John the sons of Zebedee, Philip and Bartholomew, or Nathanael. To these were now added Thomas (Didymus), and Matthew (Levi) the publican, James and Jude, or Thaddeus, sons of Alpheus and cousins of Jesus, Simon, whose surname, Zelotes, shows that he had once belonged to the party of zealots against foreign rule, and lastly, Judas Iscariot, who seems to have been the only one not a Galilean.

The poor carpenter's Son and His Galilean fishermen and publicans—these were the powers for working the greatest revolution the world had yet seen. From the time He began His public teaching He could have no safe home anywhere. When He appeared as a teacher in the synagogue at His native Nazareth the enraged inhabitants wanted to throw Him down from the steep rock their town stands on, and He only escaped by a miracle. So He travelled from town to town, from village to village, in Galilee, attended by His chosen band of disciples, and women who ministered of their means to the wants of the Lord and His followers. The

[1] Matt. iv. x.; Mark. i. iii.; Luke v. vi.

people everywhere regarded His appearance as extraordinary and significant, and connected Him as a forerunner with the expected Messiah. Some thought John the Baptist, whom Herod Antipas had beheaded, was risen again, others that Elias, or one of the old prophets had returned to life. While these carnal expectations and seditious ideas were popularly connected with the Messiah, Jesus could have no wish to be recognised as such before His Passion, and forbade His disciples to speak of it.[1]

He recognised the Scribes and Pharisees of his day as sitting in Moses' seat and having lawful authority to teach; but the whole condition of the people impressed Him with their being untaught, neglected, given over to false teachers, sheep without a shepherd. His compassion for them made him send the apostles on a preliminary mission to go two and two through the country, with power to heal diseases, to preach everywhere the tidings of His coming, and of the near approach of God's kingdom. At another time He sent out a larger body of disciples trained by Himself, the seventy, to go into all the places He meant to visit and prepare the people for His appearance and teaching.[2]

More than once His life was endangered by a popular tumult. The Pharisees watched and spied after Him everywhere. But His presence inspired a kind of awe which long kept them from laying hands on Him. Once the Sanhedrim sent their servants to seize and

[1] Luke iv. 29, 30; viii. 1 sqq. Matt. xvi. 14, 20.
[2] Matt. xxiii. 2; ix. 36. Luke x. 1 sqq.

bring Him before them, but they were disarmed by the power of His words, and could not fulfil their commission. Scribes were sent from Jerusalem with orders to follow and watch Him. The Pharisees scattered over Galilee and Judea used their influence everywhere with the people to counteract His. There were those among the priests and scribes in the capital who judged Him worthy of death as a breaker of the law, and urged His being quietly made away with. He seemed to them to display a studied contempt of their maxims; He taught men that their righteousness must be other and better than that of the Pharisees, outward and fictitious with its show of scrupulous obedience. They saw in Him a dangerous enemy who threatened and undermined their whole influence and credit with the people. He had not studied in their school, paid no regard to their traditional glosses on the Law, and ventured sometimes to put them to shame before the people by His striking answers. He knew men's hearts, and often replied more to their thoughts than their words, which made them the more indignant at seeing their inward nakedness so cuttingly exposed.[1]

He had much to bear patiently even from His apostles, with their want of insight, their national prejudices, their carnal expectations and wishes, and their consequently always misconceiving His office. What He said about His future kingdom, eating and drinking His flesh and blood, and His return to the Father, was a pure enigma to them. At last they got so far that

[1] John v., vii., viii., xi. Matt v., xxi., xxiii., xxvi.

Peter could express in his own name and theirs the firm belief that He alone was the Messiah, the Son of God. Thenceforth He tried to familiarize them with the thought that they would lose Him through a violent death endured in the discharge of His office. He no longer busied himself chiefly with the miracle-loving crowds who were always thronging and pressing upon Him, but always fickle, carried about, as it were, by opposite winds, at one time from the influence of the Pharisees, at another from the impression produced by His own presence and acts. From this time He withdrew Himself more from public view, and only wrought miraculous cures on special occasions. He occupied Himself, on the other hand, all the more carefully with His disciples; His chief work now was to prepare them for their office, to train them for His representatives and successors in the mission He had undertaken.

So infinitely was Christ exalted above all human teachers, that in Him word and deed, the idea and its realisation, were always one. What He taught referred principally to Himself, His mission, His work; the mere fact of His appearance among men was the most eloquent sermon; His very presence, His acts, His sufferings, and His death, were the living, energizing commentary on His teaching, and its most superabundant confirmation. He put forth no detailed doctrine about God, His being, His attributes, and tokens; but he offered Himself directly as the Image of the Father, so that whoever knew Him knew the Father. He spoke little about God being merciful towards men, and loving them as a

father loves his children; but He presented Himself to them as the living embodiment of mercy, in whose person God had humbled Himself to man's estate. When He said, "All power is given to Me in heaven and upon earth,"[1] it was but a description of His own acts, for where He worked, the blind saw, the lame walked, and the dead were raised. In that fulness of power which He exercised on earth as the mighty Ruler of nature and of natural forces, men were able, and were bound to recognise that the Supreme Lord and Lawgiver of all had appeared in His Person. He not only, like John, exhorted men to repentance, He not only spoke of the righteousness of God, and His displeasure against sin; but He took also on Himself the greatest of all penances, He showed through His sufferings and His voluntary death what an offering the holiness of God and the sinfulness of men required. What gave to His teaching about the powerlessness of death, the indestructibility of life, and the future resurrection of man its convincing power, was the fact of His appearing among men Himself for forty days as the Conqueror of death and the First-fruits of the resurrection.

Thus, then, His works, like His words, had a stamp peculiarly their own. To work miracles was His natural, His normal state; He showed Himself in His miracles as the Lord and Ruler of nature. He commanded the winds and they were still; He walked upon the waves; He attested His power over nature, and His human kindliness, by turning water into wine; He fed thousands

[1] John xii. 45; xiv. 7—10. Matt. xxviii. 18.

with a few loaves and fishes; He freed those possessed with devils; He healed multitudes of the sick. Even in the earlier period of His ministry, the fame of His wonderful healings had spread through Galilee, and the sick streamed together to Him.[1] He fanned into a new flame the spark of life when already quenched, and raised the daughter of Jairus, the youth of Nain, His friend Lazarus. In remoter regions, also, He performed healings, as on the servant at Capernaum, the son of the royal officer there, and the daughter of the Canaanitish woman. Thus was every step of His way marked by deeds of mercy, not wrought through human means, through gold or goods, but by the divine powers He possessed in Himself to form, to uphold, to heal. He was busied till late into the night with healing the sick, who were brought to Him in great numbers.[2] It seemed as if an atmosphere of health and blessing breathed around Him. Diseases of the body, sins and errors of the mind, fled at His approach. A healing virtue streamed from the very touch of His garment, as indeed what took place in His own case, His transfiguration, and at last His resurrection and ascension, showed that His very bodily nature was permeated and ruled by the divine. He could likewise endue His disciples with the gift of working miracles. He usually wrought His cures by the laying on of hands, for in the hand the whole power of man's will is concentrated; but often the effect followed immediately on a mere word from Him, a command, or a prayer. The

[1] Matt. iv. 24. [2] Luke iv. 40; Mark ii. 4.

miracles by which He freely encroached on the life of nature were almost always of help, and not of punishment; one only was destructive, the curse of the barren fig-tree, to give a typical sign of His judicial power over mankind.

These miracles often took place before a crowd of spectators, and before men of the most hostile disposition, opponents who had only one way of evading their force, by objecting that they were wrought through the aid of diabolical powers.[1] Some were actually submitted to judicial examination.[2] He was wont to call on the Father to prosper a miracle He was just about to work,[3] and to thank Him, before it was wrought, for the result confidently anticipated; to the Father He bade those healed to offer their thanksgiving.[4] To those "works" he referred both the Jews and His own disciples as proofs of His divine mission;[5] they bore a greater witness to Him than that of the Baptist,[6] for they were to publish His mission before the eyes of those who had no ears to hear His message, and to prepare the way for its acceptance; help and redemption in the natural order were to point to that redemption of the spirit which was His proper office. He freed some men from the mediate or immediate consequences of sin in the bodily life, that all might recognise His power and will to free them from its natural consequences, the perversion of the will, and

[1] Luke xi. 15.
[2] John ix. 18 sqq.
[3] Mark vi. 41, vii. 34; John xi. 41 sqq.
[4] Mark v. 19; Luke xvii. 18.
[5] John x. 25 sqq.
[6] John v. 36.

the darkening of the intellect. He wrought many miracles with the professed object that the Son of God might gain honour by them, and His dignity and mission be acknowledged. And if in some cases He forbade His miracles being made known,[1] this was partly because the time had not yet come when their publication could take place with advantage, partly because He wished to avoid a popular tumult, which would at once have assumed a political character, and led to His being proclaimed as king; and, further, that a quiet demeanour in those healed might confirm the influence of the teaching they had received. The only condition He required for healing men was faith, a trustful surrender of the will to His mighty power; whence it is said that He *could* not work many miracles where He found no faith. A carnal hankering after miracles He always repulsed. He withdrew from those who, out of mere idle curiosity, expected or desired a sign from heaven, a wonderful spectacle to gaze at.[2]

To His power over external nature was joined His prophetic power of gazing into the future. He foretold the destruction of Jerusalem, the fall of the temple, and the permanent dispersion of the Jews among all nations. So, too, He declared that His being lifted up to die on the cross would draw men to Him with a powerful attraction; and that God's children among both Jews and Gentiles would be united, under His Shep-

[1] Mark vii. 36.

[2] Matt. xii. 38 sqq. Luke xxiii. 8. Matt. xxiv. 2 sqq. Luke xix. 41–4.

herd's staff, in one fold.[1] He foretold that before the end, the Gospel of the kingdom of God would be preached to all peoples in the whole world, and that his Church, at first, like the grain of mustard seed, small and invisible, would grow in process of time to a mighty tree, overshadowing all things.

Jesus was the first who distinctly and clearly taught men to look upon God as a Father, as One in whom is united the whole fulness of what is called love. In the Old Testament, indeed, God was represented as a Father, but chiefly in relation to the people He had chosen out and educated; and the contemporaries of Jesus, if they declared themselves to be the children of God, had before their eyes simply the fact of their belonging to the chosen people. But He taught men to acknowledge God as a Father, and themselves as His children, because they were designed to attain a moral and spiritual likeness to this Father of theirs through love,[2] and thereby to inherit His kingdom; because the love which God has from eternity for His Son is also extended to those who believe in Him.

While He represented Himself as the Lord of the angel world, he declared this earth to be the field where He sowed His seed, and on which He was to reap His harvest. The future history of mankind was to be measured by His departure and His return, His second coming was to be the end of the course of this world. Just as, in the Old Testament, the bond which united

[1] John x. 16; xii. 32. Matt. xxiv. 14; xiii. 31, 32.

[2] Matt. v. 48. John viii. 41; xvii. 26.

the Jewish nation to God was represented under the marriage relation, so Christ described Himself as the Bridegroom, but at the same time Lord and Lawgiver, of all mankind who are called to believe in Him. He wished men to regard themselves as His servants, stewards, and subjects, and so much the more, since He would one day be their Judge, and, as the Father had given Him to have life in Himself, would, by His almighty voice call the dead to rise out of their graves.[1]

He claimed the same devotion, generally, for Himself as for the Father. All were to honour the Son as they honoured the Father, for He is the fountain of life to all who believe in Him, the vine of which all believers are living and fruitful branches, and possesses in Himself an everlasting, unbeginning life, exalted above all change and possibility of decay. From heaven had He come down, for in heaven He had dwelt of old with the Father before He appeared on earth, yea, before the world was, had the Father loved Him and given to Him the full enjoyment of glory.[2] He said to His enemies, "Before Abraham was, I am," to indicate the unchangeableness of His divine life, which excluded all notion of beginning or of ceasing to be.[3] By the Father's gift He had an independent fountain of life in Himself, from which, henceforth, all men were to obtain life.[4] To Him, who was the Son of the Father in a sense belonging only to Himself, the Father had entrusted the whole

[1] Matt. xiii. xxiv. xxv. Luke xix. 13—27.
[2] John v. 23; xvi. 28; xvii. 5, 24.
[3] John viii. 56.
[4] John v. 26.

work of human salvation,[1] so that no man could come to the Father but through Him,[2] and to Him soon would all power in heaven and on earth be given. The Father made Him the all-wise Judge of the world, so that those He pardoned would rise to the resurrection of life, and those He rejected to the resurrection of judgment.[3] He and the Father were One, not only in will, but by the most intimate union of mutual life in each other, so that the Father dwelt in Him, and whoever had seen Him had seen the Father. His Person was the mirror of the Godhead, the majesty and the condescending love of the divine nature shone out of His words and works.[4]

On the last evening which He spent with His disciples, He revealed to them that there was a Third Person in the Godhead, the Holy Ghost. This Spirit, the Spirit of truth, who proceeds from the Father, and will testify of Jesus, He meant to send them.[5] As the Son was sent by the Father because He derives from the Father the origin of His life and being, so would the Holy Ghost be sent by both the Son and the Father, because He derives His origin from both, and is therefore called the Spirit of the Father and the Son. Thus the Son is the Fountain, not only of finite and created, but also of infinite life, and so far like in being to the Father. But it was only after His resurrection, and at the close of His earthly pilgrimage, that Jesus spoke out fully the threefold personality of God, when He bade His disciples baptize in the

[1] Matt. xi. 27. Luke x. 22.
[2] John xiv. 6.
[3] John v. 27 sqq.
[4] John xiv. 7—10.
[5] John xv. 26; vi. 17.

Name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and thereby taught them that Each of those Three is of divine nature, and of like substance, Each the source of salvation to men.[1]

At the same time, He named Himself with peculiar emphasis and predilection the "Son of Man." This expression He had borrowed from the prophet Daniel, who after the fall of the four empires saw One, like the Son of Man, coming with the clouds of heaven, and brought before the Ancient of Days, and dominion, glory, and an everlasting kingdom were given Him.[2] Therefore, in that solemn and decisive moment, when the High Priest adjured Him to say if He were the Son of God, while replying that He was, He called Himself also the "Son of Man," who would hereafter appear, sitting on the right hand of God, and coming in the clouds of heaven.[3] He meant, by his frequent use of this name, to make them understand, that He was the true, ideal, long-expected Man, the Second Adam, the Flower and Centrepoint of Humanity; and finally, He loved the name because, while intimating His dignity it yet concealed it from the unthinking multitude.

As true, genuine, perfect Man, like in all points to His earthly brothers, He was subject in every respect to the needs, the mental emotions, the dispositions of soul which belong to humanity. Those means and exercises which man requires to assure the mastery of spirit over matter, and to cherish communion of soul

[1] Matt. xxviii. 19. [2] Dan. vii. 13, 14. Matt xxvi. 64.
[3] Matt. xxvi. 63, 64.

with God, He, too, made use of. He prepared by a forty days' fast for entering on His ministry, and overcame the temptations of the devil which then assailed him;[1] He prayed much, and for long at a time; even when working miracles He prayed for the power, and ascribed the performance to God's having heard His prayer.[2] He felt a holy indignation at seeing the temple desecrated by buyers and sellers; He was bound to one of His disciples in a tender friendship; He felt a deep sympathy with the sorrows of others which moved Him even to tears;[3] He was constrained to shed tears as He foresaw the fate of Jerusalem.[4] He wept over the closed grave of Lazarus, over the grave opened for His city. The foresight of His impending sufferings filled Him with bitter anguish.[5] He felt, as a man capable of suffering, that horror at the approach of a painful death which is natural to flesh and blood. Thus He took on Himself in the completest sense the nature of man, pure and simple, only uncorrupted by sin. Never had the idea of man, as it existed in the divine mind, been so absolutely realised. This form is held up for all times as the ideal, unattainable indeed, but which all must strive after, as the one and highest specimen of humanity.

Above all, He was not only the Teacher but the Model of love, such love as men had never known before, not sensuous and self-seeking, but a pure love

[1] Matt. iv. 1 sqq. Luke vi. 1 sqq.
[2] Mark vii. 34. John xi. 41 sqq.
[3] John xi. 35.
[4] Luke xix. 41.
[5] Luke xii. 50. John xii. 27.

exalted above all carnal impulses, and all selfishness, (*Charity*). There were some, indeed, for whom He felt a more special love, as John and Lazarus; but His affection had nothing of instinct or mere habit about it, it was one with His holiness, it was a virtue. What was outward, accidental, self-interested, had no place in it; it was the love which pierces through all veils and bars of flesh or sense, and unites the immortal, soul to soul; that love, in a word, which as He Himself said, gave its life for its friends in proof of its irresistible force, and treating sinners as already friends, died for them.[1]

It was not only, however, by His appearance and whole course of life that Jesus reminded men how far gone they were from the original type of manhood; He spoke it out shortly and energetically in the form of doctrine. He declared man to be a creature of carnal mind naturally, and morally imperfect, one in whose very nature sinful inclination was ingrained.[2] That sinfulness which is dominant and overpowering in the whole race of man, that collective common life of sin, depending on spiritual infection and evil example, which then ruled supreme in the earthly order and corrupted it to the heart's core—that Jesus summed up under the name of the "world," as contradistinguished from the believers chosen out of it.[3] But, then, there is also, as He said, a Prince of this world, that fallen Ruler of spirits, that murderer and liar from the beginning, who has estranged himself from divine truth, and set himself in

[1] John xv. 13. [2] John iii. 6. [3] Matt. xviii. 7. John vii.; viii. 23.

chronic antagonism to it, that first author of man's sin, the murderous enemy of his spiritual and natural life, through whom death came into the world; namely, Satan.[1] He is the lord of a wide and graduated kingdom, with his angels, whom he uses as instruments.[2] He is an all too powerful ruler, through that universal sinfulness, which, up to the time of Jesus, had displayed itself in the order of the world: and Jesus pointed out that to break his dominion, to judge the Prince of this world, was a work directly belonging to Himself as the Son of Man.[3]

The Baptist had called Jesus the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world. He meant to say that Jesus was the anti-type of that Paschal Lamb whose blood was sprinkled on the door-posts of the houses of the Israelites that the first-born who dwelt there might be spared;[4] that He was that gentle patient Lamb, appointed for the slaughter-house, who after the prophecy of Isaiah was to take on himself the sins of His people.[5] He Himself, however, up to the close of His public ministry, only spoke in hints and figuratively of His mission as Redeemer. He said He was the Physician of the spiritually sick,[6] come to seek and to save that which was lost,[7] not come to be ministered unto but Himself to minister.[8] He spoke of the Son of Man having to be lifted up, as the brazen serpent

[1] John xii. 31; viii. 44.
[2] Matt. xxv. 41; xii. 24—26.
[3] John xvi. 11; xii. 31.
[4] Exod. xii. 13.
[5] Isa. liii. 7.
[6] Matt. ix. 12.
[7] Matt. xviii. 11. Luke xix. 10.
[8] Matt. xx. 28.

was lifted up by Moses.[1] Later again He described Himself as the good Shepherd, who giveth His life for the sheep.[2] For the first time, just before His Transfiguration, and for the last time, soon after it, on His last journey to Jerusalem, He said plainly that He would give His life a ransom for many.[3] After His entrance into Jerusalem He spoke again enigmatically and prophetically about the corn of wheat which must first be laid in the ground and die, that it may bear much fruit,[4] adding that if He were lifted up from the earth He would draw all men to Him, Gentile and Jew alike.[5] And by this He signified that His death, that act of self-sacrificing love, would exert the greatest power of attraction over men, and His deepest abasement turn to His highest honour and glorification; that from all nations, and all over the world, those disposed to receive Him would gather themselves to Him, and be united as one fold under one Shepherd.[6] Yet it was only on the eve of His death, at the institution of the Eucharist, that He first spoke, quite clearly and openly, in a way every one could understand, of the necessity and significance of His death. Then it was that He declared He had devoted Himself as the new Paschal Lamb, and that by His blood, which he would shed for the world, the new Covenant, a Covenant of perfect reconciliation and most intimate union with God, would

[1] John iii. 14. [2] John x. 11.

[3] Matt. xvi. 21; xvii. 9, 22; xx. 18 sqq.; xxvi. 32. Luke xxiv. 46. John x. 17.

[4] John xii. 24. [5] John xii. 32. [6] John x. 16.

be sealed and dedicated, and that so His death was a sacrifice offered for the sins of men, His blood the means to secure the remission of their sin.[1]

Jesus required faith and repentance as conditions of sharing the benefits of His kingdom. Men were to believe on Him, that is, to acknowledge His Person and dignity with lively joy, to receive and appropriate His words as the purest utterance of divine truth, to trust Him as the Surety and Mediator of divine grace through whom they had access to God. But this belief God must work in us, through Him we were to be made partakers of all divine graces, and especially was it His will that eternal life should be the reward of faith in His Son. Without repentance, however, this faith is neither possible nor availing to salvation. Those alone are real believers who unite a humble confession of their own guilt and strong hatred of sin, as the cause of their alienation from God, with a conviction of the inadequacy of their own moral powers, and come to Christ in earnest self-abasement, weary and heavy laden with a lively yearning to be delivered, hungering and thirsting after righteousness, and with hearts full of love to Him and of forgiveness and mercy towards men. To such only He offered pardon, justification, and restoration to the state of God's children lost by sin.[2]

The commandment found in Deuteronomy, to love God above all, Christ declared to be the first and great

[1] Matt. xxvi. 25 sqq. Luke xxii. 19. John xvi. 1 sqq.

[2] Matt. iv. 17; v. 3—7; vi. 12; xi. 28. Mark i. 15; xi. 25, 26; John iii. vi. xi. Luke vii. xv. xviii.

commandment, and by this love He meant the fixing our whole mind, soul, and will upon God as the Embodiment and Archetype of perfection, and the Highest Good, who first loved us, and is the Giver of all happiness. He did not represent this as like other commandments, but as controlling them, because, where this love to God, this unconditional surrender of the whole will and all its powers to Him preponderates, every other love is sanctified and ennobled, and this becomes the guiding and determining principle of the whole will, conduct, and feelings. Christ placed on a par with this the command to love our neighbour, for he who really loves God loves his brother also for God's sake, not more, or less, or differently than he loves himself. This love, as He elsewhere taught, sees a neighbour in every man as such, without regard to national or social differences, and therefore does as it would be done by.[1]

He insisted strongly, that all this love to Him must be shown in keeping His commandments, and that all who would be His disciples, and share His promised blessings, must follow Him in self-denial and love to God and man. That He called a better righteousness than the Scribes and Pharisees had, not taking shelter, as was then frequent, under the letter of the law in its narrowest sense, as accordant with selfish interests, but fulfilling the commandment in its inward meaning and fullest extent. He further declared that those who believed on Him must love God and Himself above all, and must loosen the firmest and dearest ties of blood

[1] Deut. vi. 5. Matt. xxii. 37, 38; vii. 12. Luke x. 29 sqq.

and relationship if hindering the singleness of their love to Him. But He assured His followers of strength to fulfil this command, to make the hard soft and the difficult easy to them, and give them rest and refreshment. He pronounced them happy, and bid them rejoice that their names were written in heaven.[1]

For Jesus pointed to another world as their real home and only true life, His Father's house, wherein He reveals His essential glory, and where are many mansions, "everlasting habitations," whither He was going to prepare a place for them, that they might share His glory.[2]

At the beginning of His ministry He opposed the notion of His meaning to overthrow the old Covenant, and weaken or abolish the Law and the Prophets. He said He was come not to remove or destroy, but to fulfil Law and Prophets, command and promise, word and ordinance, the combined ingredients of the old Covenant. He would fulfil the law by making it spiritual, being the first to fulfil the whole circle of its requirements in His holy and spotless life, and by committing to His Church those higher powers which would enable all believers to keep it perfectly. The promises would be realized, partly in His own Person, partly in the Church He founded, so that what was promised would be visibly accomplished. He told them that the law comprehended in word and deed would last till the end of the

[1] John xiv. 15; viii. 12. Matt. v. x. 37; xi. 28—30. Luke ix. 57.

[2] John xiv. 2; xvii. 24. Luke xvi. 9.

present order of the world, and that His own word would outlast it, and be eternal.[1]

He, therefore, submitted to the Jewish law and institutions. He attended the synagogues on the Sabbath, and went, like other Jews, to Jerusalem on the high festivals. He ate the Paschal lamb with His disciples, and commanded the lepers He cleansed to go and show themselves to the priests, and offer the gift commanded in the Law.

He pointed out to the Pharisees that the Law was a simple, organic, coherent whole, not a stray collection of single, disconnected precepts, and that the real scope and aim of its contents was the love of God and of our neighbour.[2] He reproached them with having made void the divine law through their arbitrary and new-fangled rules, notwithstanding all their outward parade of zeal for it, and referred in proof of it to their decisions about the Corban, or gifts to the sanctuary, which, according to Rabbinical teaching, freed the son from all duty to his parents.[3]

In the same way He set aside the strict Pharisaic regulations about the observance of the Sabbath, by laying down the simple principle, that the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath, and by declaring that He, the Son of Man, was Lord also of the Sabbath, and had power to destroy or to spiritualise it, as His Church has since done, through the plenary

[1] Matt. v. 17, 18; xxiv. 35.

[2] Matt. xxii. 36 sqq. Luke x. 25 sqq. Mark xii. 28.

[3] Matt. xv. 3 sqq.

power given by Him.[1] He declared plainly that He was higher and holier than the temple,[2] though He Himself honoured it, and wished to see it honoured, and therefore zealously cleansed it from being desecrated by merchandise. He confirmed the high rank of the Jews as chosen out by God before all peoples of the earth; He said that of them was salvation, and theirs was the place appointed for it; they knew what they worshipped, while the Samaritans knew not, for their worship was grounded on no divine ordinance. Yet the Jewish worship would undergo a great revolution; the hour was already come when God would show that His service was confined within no local limits, and that He would no more be exclusively worshipped on Gerizim, the holy mountain of Samaria, or on Moriah, and in the sanctuary of Jerusalem, but without any such limits of places, as a Spirit, in spirit and in truth.[3]

While Jesus affirmed in His Sermon on the Mount that it was His office to fulfil the law completely, He also opposed His, "I say unto you," not only to the false glosses of the Pharisees, but to the express verbal statements of the old Law with all the dignity of a lawgiver, and the authority of a messenger sent from God.[4] He thereby showed what He meant by fulfilling the law, and that, as with the form of divine worship, so with the moral law itself, the time was come for breaking through the narrow bounds of nationality, for divesting

[1] Mark ii. 28. [2] Matt. xii. 6.
[3] John iv. 21 24. [4] Matt. v. 27—37.

the law, which had been given as a civil and religious bond, and an ordinance for holding together and ruling the nations, of its juridical character, so that for the sanction of judicial and police regulations might be substituted the higher and more universal rule of the holiness and righteousness of God. Whatever was unsuited to continue, as being a temporary condescension on God's part to the childhood of a people composed of sinful and carnally-minded men, Jesus abolished, and in so doing fulfilled and perfected the law, by making it correspond as an utterance of the divine will with the stage of development on which the world was entering. Thus He declared that the love of one's neighbour, which was enjoined by the old Law, was no longer limited to one's countrymen, but must include one's enemies, is the widest extent of the term,—the enemies of one's nation, and all the Heathen.

It was impossible for Him to announce openly and distinctly to the great multitude that listened to His words, that He had come to tear asunder the narrow limitations of the Jewish religious community, and to found a world-kingdom. He, therefore, never used the word Church (*Ecclesia*) in His public addresses. Only before His disciples, and only latterly before them—for even they very imperfectly comprehended the matter—did He speak more clearly about His Church. What He almost always spoke of, and that in a way often very enigmatical to His hearers, was the kingdom of God, or kingdom of heaven, which was close at hand, or actually come, confining Himself to the expression

used previously by the Prophets,[1] and adopted by the Baptist.[2] He said He was come to preach "the Gospel of the Kingdom;"[3] and this kingdom formed now the basis of His teaching. He said the time of the Old Testament economy, the Law and the Prophets, lasted till John the Baptist; since John the time of the kingdom of God was begun, and every one pressed into it by the force of his belief.[4] John himself had but pointed to the kingdom about to appear, as one standing outside it. But as most of His hearers only understood by God's kingdom a kingdom of earthly power and worldly greatness, Christ soon began to utter His doctrine about the kingdom of heaven, but only in the form of parables, which served the double object of concealing the truth they would only have misused from the carnally-minded Jews, and of presenting to His disciples expressive images to convey a doctrine, even they could not fully understand till afterwards. Hence the parables of the field, of the public feast, or great marriage supper, of the virgins, and of the labourers in the Vineyard,[5] in which He taught them about His Church. Under the veil of those similes He could say, what if openly spoken would hardly have been endured, that He had other sheep besides those of His own nation that would come from the East and from the West; that men should be invited, as from the streets, without distinction; and finally, that the Gospel shall be preached in the whole world.[6]

[1] Dan. ii. 24.
[2] Matt. iii. 2.
[3] Luke iv. 43.
[4] Matt. xi. 12. Luke xvi. 16.
[5] Matt. xiii. 24 sqq.; xx. 1—16; xxii. 14; xxv. 1—3. Luke xxii. 29.
[6] Matt. viii. 11—13. Luke xiv. 15—24. John x. 16.

By the kingdom of heaven, or of God, He understood generally that divine order of things which He had come to establish. It was a kingdom, not of this world,[1] though in the world, to which, as a kingdom revolted from God and ruled by Satan, His own stood directly opposed.[2] And so He answered the question of the Pharisees, when the kingdom of God would come, that it was already in the midst of them; its first germs and beginnings, that is, were already present in the persons of Himself and His disciples.[3] But He also predicted that a great part of His people would have no share in this kingdom, and gave them to understand in parables that the kingdom of God would no longer be entrusted to His people, as such, but other nations would be called to take their place.[4]

This kingdom, moreover, embraces in the words of Jesus heaven and earth, and the whole course of human history from His time onwards. He represented the growth and spread of His kingdom under the images of the seed developing till it bore fruit an hundredfold, and of the little mustard seed growing up into a lofty over-shadowing tree.[5] A flock of sheep with its shepherd, whose voice it knows,[6]—a family with its master, its men servants and women servants, a town, a nation, a kingdom, whose king He was Himself,[7]—these were the images by which He exhibited the organic coherence of His Church, the power and

[1] John xviii. 36.
[2] John xvi. 11—33.
[3] Luke xvii. 20, 21.
[4] Matt. xxi. 33 sqq.
[5] Matt. xiii. 3—8. Mark iv. 26—29.
[6] John x. 1—16.
[7] Matt. v. 14. John xviii. 37.

authority belonging in this His kingdom to Himself and His representatives. The ministry He meant to establish in His Church, its duties and privileges, He described under the simile of a gardener, a fisherman, and a shepherd. The ministers of His Church were to be His stewards, set over the other servants; and He promised to His apostles and their successors a special gift for the right administration of their office.[1] When there was a strife among His disciples as to which of them should be the greatest in His kingdom, He taught them that those who would be greatest, and first in His kingdom, must be the humblest, the willing servants of the rest.[2] Closely connected with this was the solemn announcement at the last farewell supper, that in return for the loyalty with which they had hitherto followed and served Him, He left them for an inheritance His kingdom, the Church, as the Father had given it to Him. In that kingdom they were to celebrate continually a holy feast at His table, sitting on twelve thrones, to judge as kings the tribes of Israel, to decide on their acceptance or rejection, and to exercise the priestly and royal power conferred upon them. It was prophesied of Christ that He should sit upon the throne of David. So, too, were they, as His representatives, to sit upon thrones in His kingdom. Their power and authority was to be equal to His who appointed them. "He that receiveth you receiveth Me, and he that receiveth Me receiveth Him that sent Me."[3]

[1] Luke xii. 42 sqq. [2] Luke xxii. 25—30. [3] Matt. x. 40.

Jesus wished to verify in the widest sense the saying that "He was come not to destroy the law, but to fulfil it." His Church had been conceived and hitherto preserved in the womb of the Jewish State and Church, as the embryo of the future Church of the New Covenant. The time was not yet come for the daughter to be fully delivered. Christ Himself attested the authority of the Synagogue in Jerusalem before the people, saying that they sat on Moses' seat, having lawful authority to teach and rule the Church. "What they teach do, but do not after their works." He knew the Synagogue would soon condemn Him to death as a blasphemer, but its authority was not yet abrogated, nor the moment for renouncing all obedience to it come; the chair of Moses was still standing. When the time came, that tribunal would be transplanted into His Church. For He had already arranged for the establishment of an authority, flowing from and supplementing His own, commensurate with that universal Church which would supersede a national Synagogue. In Him were combined the characters of Prophet, Priest, and King; by Him the Chair of Moses would be changed into the Chair of the Apostles as the eternal centre and point of unity in His Church.

He spent two years in carefully training His disciples for the office to be laid upon them, and for that end sent them out to preach, and gave them power to heal the sick. He said that He sent them as sheep among wolves, and foretold their lot among Jews and Gentiles in their future ministry. He tried to inspire them with sure confidence in God, whose Spirit would put the

right word into their mouths in critical moments, when they stood before the rulers of the world.[1]

At the turning-point, when His ministry was closing and His sufferings about to begin, Peter made confession that Jesus Christ was the Son of the living God. For this he was repaid by four closely allied promises of future power and pre-eminence in the Church. First; He should be the Rock whereon Christ would build it; secondly, the Church built on him should never fail; thirdly, Christ would give him the keys of His kingdom or Church; fourthly, what he bound or loosed on earth would be bound or loosed in heaven.[2]

Peter alone here spoke; he was not commissioned by the other apostles, and stood foremost among them through the faith given him by his heavenly Father. That faith, firm as a rock, fitted him to be the foundation of the Church, which Christ had compared to a house. Now first Simon Bar Jona perceived why the Lord originally named him Cephas, the rock. And thus Christ, like Paul afterwards, has combined the two similes of a home, and of family life. He wills to build His house, the imperishable Church, never to be overcome by the powers of death, on the believing and confessing Simon, who again is to be its foundation in the same sense as all the apostles are according to Paul or John, though excelling all others in his speciality as

[1] Matt. x. 7 sqq.

[2] Matt. xvi. 18, 19. The Greek translator of the Aramaic text was obliged to use πέτρος and πέτρα: in the original Cephas stood in each place without change of gender. "Thou art stone, and on this stone," &c., Cephas being both name and title.

chief foundation stone.[1] And in this house built upon him, Peter is to have the duties and powers, not of the master of the house—that Christ is, and remains—but of the steward. These were promised him, under the symbol of the keys, whereby he is enabled to open the treasuries of the house, to guard the spiritual stores and possessions of the Church, doctrine, and means of grace.

What is here first, according to Matthew's account, only *promised* to Peter, was after the resurrection bestowed upon him, at the third appearance of Jesus, to three apostles and three disciples only besides Peter. As He had before assured him of his future exaltation on the evidence of his divinely inspired strength of faith, so now He taught him by a question, thrice solemnly repeated, that he must also surpass the other apostles in love to Him, and be a Rock-man in love as in faith, giving him thereby an opportunity of retracting his three denials, and adding the charge thrice repeated; "Feed my lambs; feed my sheep." Thereby a chief shepherd was given to the whole Church, including the apostles, and Peter was placed in the same relation as Christ had been before to the collective body of believers, as the good Shepherd who cares for his sheep and gives himself for them out of love, not like a hireling for his own advantage.[2]

When Christ prophesied to Peter, just before the beginning of His Passion, that on the same night he would deny Him thrice, He also assured him that by

[1] Eph. ii. 19, 20; Apoc. xxi. 14. [2] John xxi. 15—17; x. 12.

virtue of a special prayer offered for him to the Father, his weakness in faith should not sink as low as complete apostacy, or determinate unbelief.[1] And He exhorted him, when recovered from his own fall, to strengthen his brethren, the apostles and other disciples, in their wavering faith; to sustain them in their discouragement, and console them with the hope of His sure and speedy resurrection.

Peter is so uniformly marked out in the Gospels, and placed in such immediate proximity to Jesus, as the shadow accompanying Him, the one who possessed His confidence and mediated between Him and the other disciples, that in this respect no other apostle comes near him. Where only the apostles are enumerated or mentioned he always stands first. All the critical moments in the life of Jesus are placed in a certain relation to him, and to him alone. To him individually Jesus ordered His resurrection to be made known; the New Testament narrative records only his failings and humiliations, not those of the other apostles; while it mentions the strength of his faith and love, and the dignity conferred in return for it, it carefully marks the depth of his fall. There is no other to whose education and training Christ devoted so much labour. Much of grave import he communicated only to Peter directly, as his future martyrdom, and his elevation to the highest dignity. And again, in his death, he was to be like his Lord.

Only in common with the other apostles did Peter receive the remaining powers left by Christ to

[1] Luke xxii. 31, 32.

His Church: viz., the power to bind and loose in a manner availing in heaven as on earth, which means to forbid and command; and finally, after the resurrection, the communication of the Spirit with power to remit and retain. Three prerogatives were left to him. He was chosen before all other apostles, and in a peculiar sense, as the foundation of the Church; to him alone were the keys given in Christ's house; he alone was to have power as shepherd of the whole flock.

For two years Jesus had laboured with unwearied love in moulding the obstinate and uncongenial material of human nature in those twelve men chosen out as the instruments for founding His Kingdom, the pillars, teachers, and rulers of His Church. But the actual mission, the conferring of the powers allotted to them, was His last concern, the decisive act which He deferred till after His resurrection, till the close of His earthly course and moment of His departure. The powers and commissions which He now gave and left to the apostles collectively He introduced in the most solemn manner and with weighty words, clenching them with promises which only He could give who had before His eyes the most distant future of His Church. In His prayer as High Priest He had said to the Father, "As Thou hast sent Me into the world, so have I sent them also into the world."[1] Now He spoke out more distinctly the similarity of this twofold mission, and renewed His declaration, that the mission given Him by the Father devolved upon them. He spoke of His own fulness of

[1] John xvii. 18.

power; He, to whom was given all power in heaven and on earth, gave full power to them to carry into all the world the preaching of His doctrine, to offer to all nations baptism and entrance into His Kingdom, on the condition of keeping His Commandments.[1] He gave them at the same time a judicial authority over men, with power to remit or retain sins. They were to teach everywhere, to baptize, to found Churches, to bind and loose, to remit and retain sins. That whoever would not hear the Church must be treated as a publican and sinner and shut out of it, He had already declared.[2] And for these ministries he promised them His abiding presence and powerful aid "always, to the end of the world,"—a promise which reached beyond their earthly life and applied to their heirs and successors. He promised them the Spirit of truth to preserve them from all doctrinal error, and lead them into all the truth, to conduct them and those that came after them continually into a deeper appreciation of the whole connection of His teaching, and to guide the organic development of that teaching in His Church. Thus had He given its Magna Charta to His Church. It was to be built on a rock; indestructible permanence, indefectibility, uniform teaching and administration of the means of grace were to belong to it securely for all time, through the assistance of Christ raised to the right hand of the Father, and of the Holy Ghost sent

[1] Matt. xxviii. 18—20. Mark xvi. 15. John xx. 21—23.
[2] Matt. xviii. 17.

by Him to abide and dwell in the Church. Henceforth no one could separate himself from the Church without separating himself from Christ, for the Church had the assurance of His perpetual presence.[1]

He meant to remain the true, though invisible King of His Church; the apostles were to be only His representatives in His absence; their power was not their own but derived from Him, and they were responsible to Him for their administration of it. "Ye shall not be called Master, or Rabbi, or Father; One is your Master, even Christ; One is your Father, He who is in Heaven; but ye are all brethren."[2] They were only to be His instruments, and He would govern His Kingdom in every age, as the One Lord and High Priest, according to His own good pleasure. And, therefore, the powers and privileges given to them did not die with them, for they had never belonged to them as their own.

He had foreseen that there would be no lack of scandals in His Church, that the evil would be constantly mixed with the good, and must often be patiently borne with by the ecclesiastical authorities, and had accordingly instructed His disciples that it was the will of God it should be so in the Church. He pointed out to them in parables, how in the field of His Church the tares would spring up among the wheat, and how both must be left to grow together till the harvest, when the Lord Himself would undertake a full sifting and separation, because else very often, from the close intertwining of wheat and tares together, the one would be rooted up

[1] John xvi. 13. [2] Matt. xxiii. 8, 10.

with the other, and more harm than good follow from a premature separation of the bad from the good in His Church.[1]

Every day brought matters nearer and nearer to a final crisis. The position which Jesus had assumed among His people made only two solutions possible, either the conversion of the whole nation to belief in Him as the true Messiah, or His condemnation and execution as a blasphemer, falsely claiming to be the promised Messiah. The temper and attitude of the most influential and powerful part of the nation, the Priests and Pharisees, placed it beyond a doubt that the latter alternative would be chosen, unless He withdrew Himself from it. The rulers of the Sanhedrim had already agreed that all who received Him openly as the Messiah should be put under ban and cast out of the Synagogue.[2] But at that time, "His hour was not yet come;" His earthly work was not yet finished; and accordingly, when He came to Jerusalem for the festivals, He always left the capital soon afterwards, and withdrew from those who wanted to use violence to imprison him.

He allowed those three disciples who had all along enjoyed His closer intimacy and more particular confidence, Peter, James, and John,—the same who were afterwards present at the bitterest of all his sufferings, the agony in Gethsemane, to witness His Transfiguration, which took place on a mountain, shortly before His last journey to Jerusalem. There His countenance

[1] Matt. xiii. 25. [2] John ix. 22.

shone like the brightness of the sun, and His raiment became glittering white, as though suffused with light, and to the two earthly witnesses were added two heavenly ones, the two greatest Prophets of the Old Law, who spoke with Him of His impending death, while a voice from above, as before at His baptism, gave solemn attestation to His Messianic dignity. For Him this Transfiguration was a dedication to His approaching sufferings, an anticipation of the glory to come after; for His disciples, who were seized with fear, and fell into a deep sleep as drunken men at the sight, crushed under the feeling of their weakness in presence of the majesty of a Teacher hitherto only seen in the form of a servant, the spectacle was a visible sign of the unity of principle between the Old and New Dispensation, and of the capability of the human body for being glorified.[1]

When, after staying and working a long while in Peræa, Jesus raised Lazarus from the dead at Bethany, before many witnesses, the miracle created a great sensation among the people.[2] The Sanhedrim, on the motion of the High Priest, Caiaphas, came to a further resolution that He should be seized and brought to trial as a deceiver of the people. Then for the third time He foretold His Passion, now close at hand, to the disciples, who were still constantly dreaming of the immediate setting up of a Jewish Messianic kingdom in all earthly splendour, and thereupon made His public

[1] Matt. xvii. 1 sqq.; Luke ix. 28–35; Mark ix. 2—9.
[2] John xi. 17—53.

entry into Jerusalem[1]. For, now that the hour was come, there was no longer any ground for a prudential holding back. He entered the capital, saluted as Son of David and Messiah by the Hosannahs of the multitude coming to the Easter festival.[2] In vain the Pharisees urged Him to forbid the vociferous homage of the people. He now taught and healed openly in the temple, which He yet once more cleansed of buyers and sellers, not without symbolic reference to His own mission of purifying Israel itself.[3] In the temple, so strong a feeling of horror came over Him at the thought of His Passion, now close at hand, that He first prayed to be "delivered from this hour;" but immediately after, in the triumphant consciousness of His lofty destiny, He made a complete offering of His will to that of the Father, and only prayed that the Father would glorify His name through His suffering of death. On this, a voice from heaven, which sounded like thunder, proclaimed that the Father accepted the offer-

[1] Matt. xx. 17—19; Mark x. 32, sqq.; Luke xix. 31, sqq.; John xii. 12, sqq.

[2] Matt. xxi. 1—11; Mark xi. 1—10; Luke xix. 29—40; John xii. 12, sqq.

[3] Matt. xxi. 12—16; Mark xi. 15—17; Luke xix. 45, sqq. [Cf. supr. p. 8. The reader will of course remember that the cleansing of the temple is placed by St. John at the commencement, by the synoptic Gospels at the conclusion of our Lord's public ministry. Whether He performed the act twice, as Dr. Döllinger here implies; or whether all the Evangelists refer to the same event, though in a different connection, as others suppose; and which date we are in the latter case to adopt, are questions disputed among modern critics in Germany. There seem strong reasons for preferring the opinion adopted by our Author.—Tr.]

ing of His Son, and would make it serve for His glorification.[1] By day He worked in the capital, spending every night till Thursday in the neighbouring village of Bethany, for Jerusalem was full of strangers, and He wished too to withdraw from His enemies. His public teaching closed with the woes pronounced on the hypocritical guides of the people, over the city and its inhabitants, whom He had so often and constantly sought in vain to draw to Himself, and over the temple devoted to speedy destruction, coupled with the prophecy that they would now fill up the measure of their fathers' sins, and bring the whole burden of their blood guiltiness on themselves and on their people.[2]

On the day before the Paschal feast,[3] at a supper held with His disciples, Jesus performed, in token of loving humility, an act which only slaves or the lowest of the company were wont to perform;—He washed His disciples' feet. He now foretold that one of them, and that one Judas, would betray Him, that Peter would

[1] John xii. 27—30.

[2] Matt. xxiii. 13, sqq.

[3] John xiii. 1, sqq. *πρὸ δὲ τῆς ἑορτῆς τοῦ πάσχα.* [The author here supposes the supper described by St. John (ch. xiii.—xvii.), to have taken place on the Wednesday evening, and to be distinct from that mentioned in the synoptic Gospels at which the Eucharist was instituted. But this method of reconciliation creates more difficulties than it removes. And it is quite clear, however the difficulty be explained, that St. John assumes the feast of the Passover to have commenced on the *Friday* evening, the day of the crucifixion (John xviii. 28), while the synoptic Gospels make our Lord eat it on the *Thursday* evening, the day of the Last Supper. (Matt. xxvi. 17, 19; Mark xiv. 12, 16; Luke xxii. 7, 13.) For patristic explanations of the difficulty see Wordsworth's *Gr. Test.*, and for modern explanations Alford's *Gr. Test.* on Matt. xxvi. 17, and John xviii. 28.—Tr.]

deny Him, and that on the night He was taken prisoner, all would forsake Him. On Thursday He ate the Passover with the Twelve, and in doing so ordained the Sacrament of His Body and Blood, which was to take its place in His Church.[1] He wished to open the eyes of His disciples to the necessity of His death as a free-will offering for them and for the whole human race, He wished to associate them with Himself in the communion of His death, and at the same time to give them the highest proof of His love.[2] He had pointed out the necessity of laying down His life for the redemption of the world on the actual day of the Passover, and had therefore taken care that His entry into Jerusalem should fall on the very day when, according to the ordinance of Moses, the Paschal lamb was chosen. The communion of the Paschal lamb, as the characteristic offering of the Old Law, had formed the foundation and centre of the whole sacrificial system of the Old Testament, and now the time was come when He was about actually to offer up His life as a Victim in place of the Paschal Sacrifice, and all the others connected with it, and also to establish in His Church an abiding sacrificial mystery, exalted high above the mere fragmentary and shadowy system of animal sacrifices.

Since the Fall, men had become incapable of offering to God of themselves the right and proper sacrifice, viz., their own persons. Since their persons had been defiled by sin, and a separation brought about between

[1] Matt. xxvi. 26—28; Mark xiv. 22—24; Luke xxii. 19, 20; 1 Cor. xi. 23.

[2] John xiii. 1, sqq.

God and man, all sacrifices were essentially insufficient, they "could not cleanse the conscience;"[1] they only pointed to the offering of a future sacrifice, from which they derived their light, their strength, and their meaning. But now He, in whom was realized the ideal of humanity, was to accomplish the one great sacrifice, all sufficient for time and eternity, by freely giving His life for the whole race, of whom He had made Himself a member: and, by at once disclosing and repairing the defectiveness of all previous sacrifices, to put His own in their place. As the Passover was a feast of life and deliverance to the people, a meal at which the people exhibited and ratified their communion with God and rejoiced in it; so was this transfigured Passover to be to them the sacrificial feast of the New Testament, wherein the faithful, by feeding on His Body, would be brought into substantial communion with the great Sacrifice, would receive remission of their sins, be cleansed and sanctified, and united as members to the body of which Christ is the Head, and thus be able to offer themselves as a sacrifice to their reconciled God.

When He blessed the Bread and Wine, His eye was fixed on His approaching death upon the cross on the morrow, and on the whole course of earthly time, and the development of the human race. His priesthood, which He began with His assumption of human nature, was not to terminate and be laid aside with one act of sacrifice once offered; He meant to exercise it continually in the world above before the Father, and here

[1] Heb. ix. 9.

below through human representatives, who, under the veil of bread and wine were to offer Himself, His glorified Body, His spiritualised Blood, and with it those who fed upon Him, the uninterrupted offering of the Church, constantly realising itself, yet ever one and the same.

What He was in no position to testify to the world on the following day, when the soldiers laid their rude hands upon Him and bound Him—that His death was really an offering, a free-will surrender of Himself—that He testified now; "What I give you to eat is My Body which is broken for you, what ye drink is My Blood which I shed for you." Thus were the altars of His Church for the future to be one with the Cross, the same Body, the same Sacrifice here as there, one single, great offering, not repeated, but extended in time to be co-extensive with the duration of His Church; this was the one oblation truly worthy of the divine Majesty, and the solemn worship of the New Covenant, which would not be less but far more real in His Church than that preparatory and typical system of sacrifices and ceremonies administered hitherto by the sons of Aaron.

So did He attain in the simplest manner the double object of giving to His Church a continual sacrifice and a centre-point of common worship, and at the same time of giving to believers a food which would convey to the whole man, body and soul, the benediction and the sanctifying power of His own Humanity, and plant in them the germs of future immortality. This was done by His elevating bread and wine, as representing the most elementary ingredients of man's bodily food, by a sub-

stantial change, but in a sphere removed from all cognizance of sense, to the dignity of His glorified Body and Blood, penetrated with the powers of His divine life. Thus the Eucharist was the fulfilment of what He had begun in the Incarnation, and thus He provided for the incorporation of His Church in all future generations, that it might continually be able to appear before God as an acceptable sacrifice, being inseparably united to Himself.

While Jesus was awaiting the moment of His seizure in the Garden of Gethsemane, an overpowering feeling of agony and dereliction came over Him. He felt, as no other man has felt it, the bitterness of death as the wages of sin, in the consciousness that the sins of the whole world were laid upon Him as the sin-offering. His horror of death was in Him, above all, a horror of sin; and His human nature, sinking under this feeling, required the support of an angel sent to strengthen Him. A passing wish came over Him that, if it were possible, this chalice of agony might pass from Him; this greatest of all crimes be spared His people, and a pain be removed in which none could even distantly resemble Him. But the next instant, the clear returning consciousness of the irrevocable counsel of God triumphed in Him.[1]

After the mental struggle in Gethsemane, He was betrayed by Judas with a kiss, and seized by the soldiers sent from the Supreme Council. Before surrendering Himself into their hands to be bound, He made them

[1] Matt. xxvi. 36 sqq.; Mark xiv. 32 sqq., Luke xxii. 40.

feel His greatness, and they sank to the earth before the majesty that shone out from Him.[1] The way the Sanhedrim dealt with Him was short and simple. When the depositions of the witnesses about Him did not agree together, as the Law required, the High-priest, Caiaphas, challenged Him to declare on oath whether He was the Son of God. His calm reply, that He was, left to His judges only the alternative of either acknowledging their belief in His being what He professed to be, or condemning Him to death as a blasphemer. They did not hesitate to do the latter, and, to express abhorrence at the blasphemy he had heard, the High-priest rent his garments.[2] But, to avoid taking the odium of His execution on themselves with the people who were still greatly attached to Him, and to procure His crucifixion instead of the stoning ordered by the Law, they impeached Him as guilty of high treason before the Roman procurator, Pilate, forgetting that they had already sentenced Him to death themselves.[3] His answers to Pilate impressed him with a conviction of His innocence, but when the Jews pressed their accusation, Pilate tried to relieve himself from a disagreeable demand by sending Jesus as a Galilean to His native prince, Herod Antipas, who was then in Jerusalem. The wanton Herod, who saw in Christ only an obstinate but harmless enthusiast, not a subject for death but for contempt and mockery, sent Him back to Pilate, who

[1] John xviii. 4—9.

[2] Matt. xxvi. 59—66; Mark xiv. 55—64; Luke xxii. 66—71.

[3] [See Appendix II. on power of life and death in the Sanhedrim.—Tr.]

sought in vain to deliver Him by the custom of the feast which required the release of one condemned criminal, for the people, at the Pharisees' instigation, preferred the robber and murderer, Barabbas.[1] Then Pilate sentenced Him to be scourged and crucified, while declaring that He was an innocent and righteous man. Even his last attempt to rouse the compassion of the people by bringing Jesus forward scourged and bleeding, and clothed in mockery in the insignia of royalty, was a failure. Intimidated at the threatening reference made by the Priests to the Emperor, designating Christ as a political conspirator, he ordered the sentence of crucifixion to be executed.

The cross of the Lord was set up on Golgotha between two malefactors. While the guard were dividing His garments among them, the priests and people and even one of those crucified with Him mocking and blaspheming Him, He prayed that they might be forgiven, because they knew not what they did. He had rejected the stupifying potion offered Him, that He might die with full and clear consciousness His death of sacrifice. All His disciples had left Him and were fled; Peter had thrice denied Him; only His favourite John stood beneath the cross. As a reward, the care of the Lord's Mother was entrusted to him. At that supreme moment of almost intolerable suffering, when His whole soul was as it were overpowered, and for an instant crushed, the cry of agony broke from Him at being forsaken of God, in the words of that Psalm which pre-

[1] John xviii. 31 sqq.

dicts His Passion, and which He thus made His own.[1] Then He testified that His work of redemption was finished, and died, commending His Spirit into the hands of His Father, on Friday, the 15th Nisan, or 7th April, 783, A.U.C., the year 30 of the Christian era. The extraordinary phenomena of nature at His death, the darkening of the sun, and the earthquake, were indications that the whole of nature was drawn into passionate sympathy with the death of its Lord, and the rending of the veil of the temple that concealed the Most Holy place showed that by the Redeemer's death the wall of partition was thrown down, and the entrance to the Most Holy, the kingdom of God on earth, laid open to all mankind.

The corpse, which for greater security had been pierced with a lance, was guarded by a watch of soldiers in its sealed grave. But He had declared that, as He laid down His life of His own free will, so He would take it again by His own power,[2] and would only remain three days among the dead. This coming forth from the grave was to be the great and decisive sign given even to those who would not believe the other evidences of His power.[3] On the day of His resurrection He appeared to Mary Magdalene, to Peter, to two disciples on the way to Emmaus, and late at night to the assembled apostles. So little could they at first take in the fact and trust their senses, notwithstanding His predictions, that the Lord was obliged to convince them

[1] Matt. xxvii. 46; Ps. xxi. 1; (xxii. 1. E.V.)
[2] John x. 17, 18. [3] Matt. xii 38—40.

of the reality of His body come forth from the grave, by letting them touch it, and by eating some food.[1] Eight days later, when Thomas, who had before been away, and was still unbelieving, was present, He appeared again among them, and this time Thomas convinced himself and acknowledged his Lord and his God. But it was not in Jerusalem, or by His enemies, that He chose to be seen; in Galilee, where He had carried on His ministry. and found the greatest number of followers, it was His will to appear to this multitude of believers,[2] and at the same time to prepare His apostles for the discharge of their ministry after His departure. By His command, the disciples went directly after Easter from Jerusalem into Galilee;[3] and here He appeared first to seven of His disciples on the lake of Tiberias, where Peter was declared to be the Head of His Church.[4] More than five hundred disciples saw Him there and heard His words.[5] Shortly before Pentecost, the apostles returned to Jerusalem, and were there also strengthened and taught by repeated visits of Jesus. His appearance, His form, His demeanour convinced them that He had indeed a true body and was no unsubstantial spirit, but that His Body was no longer subject to the limits and conditions of earthly and corporeal existence, that it was glorified. In a room with closed doors, He stood suddenly in the midst of them; sometimes His form was known to them; sometimes it was strange and could not be recognised. Finally, on a

[1] John xx. 1 sqq. [2] Matt. xxviii. 10. [3] Matt. xxviii. 16.
[4] John xxi. 1 sqq. [5] 1 Cor. xv. 5—8.

Thursday, the fortieth day after His resurrection, He appeared for the last time to His apostles on the Mount of Olives, near Bethany; He commanded them to tarry in Jerusalem for the outpouring of the Holy Ghost; and then, while a cloud withdrew Him from their gaze, He ascended and returned to the glory of the Father.[1]

[1] Mark xvi. 19; Luke xxiv. 50, 51; Acts i. 4 sqq.

CHAPTER II.

ST. PETER AND ST. PAUL.

When Jesus departed from the earth, He left only small and scanty beginnings of a new Church. He had appeared in Galilee to five hundred brethren after His resurrection; one hundred and twenty disciples, including the apostles, were now assembled in Jerusalem. It was natural that those only should believe on Him who had seen and heard Him since His resurrection, and these amounted to at most about six hundred. This was the hidden mustard seed, and nothing could be unlikelier in all human estimation, than that out of this little gathering of peasants and craftsmen, fishers and publicans, among whom there was not even one man of cultivation, who were alike unacquainted with the world and unknown by it, should grow that mighty tree overshadowing the world, a Church embracing millions, and from nations the most widely separated.

The first thing to be done was to fill up the number of the apostolic college. This number of twelve Jesus had fixed according to the original number of the

family from which the people of Israel were descended. Before the outpouring of the Holy Ghost this number had to be restored, and the vacancy caused by the fall of Judas to be filled, and that by a man who had been an eyewitness and disciple of Jesus during the whole time of His earthly ministry. This was done under the direction of Peter in an assembly of the little community. Christ Himself was to decide by the lot between the two proposed, for He alone could confer the apostolic office. Thus Matthias became one of the Twelve.

On the feast of Pentecost, in the year 783, ten days after the Ascension of Jesus, the feast when the Jews brought bread and meal into the temple as first fruits of the harvest to consecrate to Jehovah, the outpouring of the Holy Ghost took place. The first fruits of the new harvest of the Spirit, the disciples, were assembled in a house. Long ago had the Prophets promised a great and mighty outpouring of the divine Spirit upon whole communities, upon every sex and age, and that God would write His law upon their heart and mind, and give them a new heart and a new spirit.[1] Jesus Himself had repeatedly promised this outpouring to His disciples, adding, however, that it could not take place till after His departure from the earth, that His human form and appearance to which they had too carnal an attachment must be removed from them, before their hearts would be a fitting soil to receive the gifts of the Spirit.[2] Thus, then, came that outpouring, the baptism of the Spirit

[1] Joel ii. 28, 29; Ez. xi. 19 sqq. [2] John xvi. 7.

and of fire which John the Baptist had already announced as the work of Christ. As fire pierces through to the marrow while water remains on the surface, so was the Spirit from on high of whom that fire is a type to penetrate the apostles and disciples to their very inmost soul, and fill them with His gifts; He was, as Jesus said, to clothe them with power from on high.[1] The sound of a mighty wind, and the appearance of tongues of flame, symbols of the Spirit and of the new gift of tongues, over the heads of the assemblage, including the women who were present, announced the communication of the Holy Ghost. Its first result was a state of ecstasy, in which the possessed spoke in foreign languages, hitherto unknown to them, especially the Greek and Persian, and in various dialects, and were understood by the Hellenistic Jews from the dispersion, who had come to Jerusalem for the feast, and by the Proselytes, while the native Israelites, who did not know these languages, mocked them, thinking they were already drunken with wine early in the morning. This was the beginning and inauguration of the great work, destined to re-unite in one vast communion the human race which had been split up and divided into hostile nations since the confusion of tongues, to exalt all languages into instruments of the one uniform truth, and bind together the peoples hitherto sharply sundered from each other in the higher unity of the Church. Sometimes after this, the communication of the Holy Ghost, or rather the renewal of the occurrence of Pentecost, took place in

[1] Luke xxiv. 49 (ἐνδύσησθε).

the same striking and sensible manner. The first time was when another outpouring of the Spirit on those assembled, accompanied by the same sign of shaking the house, followed the thanksgiving offered by the apostles Peter and John, when they returned to their friends after being released from imprisonment.[1] The second time was when the first Proselytes of the gate were received into the Church, and the phenomenon of speaking with tongues was repeated.[2] The same thing occurred with the Samaritans, and with those disciples of John on whom Paul laid his hands at Ephesus.[3]

The address of Peter on the occurrence of the Pentecostal miracle had a powerful effect. The impression of what they had seen and heard had already prepared the hearts of many to receive his words; "An old promise is here fulfilled before your eyes. All those who are the subjects of this miracle believe firmly that He whom ye, the nation, crucified fifty days ago through your Sanhedrim is the Messiah. Him ye have dared to slay, as was permitted in the counsels of God, but He, as David's Son, and in fulfilment of a promise, has overcome death; He is risen, and has endued us, the witnesses of His resurrection, with these gifts of the Spirit, as a guarantee of the truth." Then were fulfilled those words of the Prophet: "they shall look on Him whom they have pierced, and shall mourn for Him as for an only Son."[4] Three thousand were at once baptized.

The first fair days of the young Church had begun.

[1] Acts iv. 31.
[2] Acts x. 46.
[3] Acts viii. 18.; xix. 6.
[4] Zech. xii. 10.

But the believers were still in a quite peculiar and expectant transition-state; the Church, so to speak, was but half-born, the other half was still in the womb of the Synagogue. The followers of Jesus were under the guidance of the Apostles, but they continued to acknowledge the authority of the chair of Moses in Jerusalem. God had not yet abolished the Synagogue; the Sanhedrim still asserted a rightful jurisdiction over the Jewish Church, and the believers submitted to it on all points but one, where they "must obey God rather than man." They were still members of the great politico-religious organization of their people, and were willing to fulfil all the obligations of membership; they resorted to the temple, as still being the one Sanctuary of the one God, they joined in the public solemnities, and public prayer, but they also frequently met among themselves to hear the apostles, to pray, and "to break bread," *i.e.*, to celebrate the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ. Their abiding inspiration, the example of Jesus and the apostles, and also the expectation of the approaching judgment on Jerusalem and Judæa, acted so powerfully, that the multitude of their own accord introduced a community of goods among themselves, so that every man regarded and used his private purse as what the brethren had a right to share in, and many who had real estates sold them, that the proceeds might be applied by the apostles to the common wants of all. This example, however, was not followed by any of the daughter Churches. When Ananias and Sapphira, through their hypocrisy and avaricious attempt at de-

ception, had made the first assault on the authority of the apostles and the Holy Ghost ruling in the Church, Peter inflicted a terrible punishment upon them.[1]

The event of Pentecost, and its consequences, had left the authorities in Jerusalem outwardly quiet and inactive. Many meantime were indignant or alarmed at the dangerous sect, which they thought to have trodden down like a worm by the death of its Founder, suddenly lifting its head again, and preaching the resurrection of the Crucified One, while thrusting His death in the teeth of the nation, as a great wickedness. Then followed the public healing of the lame man at the gate of the temple by Peter, and a second speech of the Apostle, addressed this time to the crowd of worshippers assembled. It is not we, he told them, who have performed this cure; it is Jesus, whom ye through ignorance have killed, in whose Name this man is made whole.[2] His summons, which followed, to turn to Jesus with penitent conversion, was interrupted by the soldiers of the temple guard sent from the priests and Sadducees, who seized Peter and his companion John. Peter declared before the Sanhedrim that there was no other name given whereby men could be saved, but only the name of Jesus; and appealed against their prohibition to preach this Name to the higher will of God; they could not but proclaim what they had seen and heard.[3] This occurrence was again followed by a great increase

[1] Acts v. 1—10.
[2] Acts iii. 12—26.
[3] Acts iv. 1. sqq.

of the new community, so that the number of its members had already advanced to five thousand. A close bond of mutual love bound together the daily growing society who were wont to assemble in Solomon's Porch, regarded by tradition as a relic of the old temple. They were looked upon by the people with a kind of shrinking awe.[1] The fame of the extraordinary events of Pentecost, and of the numerous healings which surrounded the path of the infant Church, as of its Divine Founder, encircled them in public estimation with a halo which even their enemies for a time scrupled to touch. As Peter on all occasions took the precedence, acting and speaking first, as being the head of the young Church, on him, too, the gift of healing chiefly rested. Already the sick were brought from the neighbouring towns, and the pressure on him was so great that they had to be placed on their beds in the streets, that only the shadow of the Apostle as he passed might fall upon them.[2]

The apostles having been imprisoned anew, at the suggestion of the Sadducees in concert with the high priest Annas, were miraculously set free and preached again immediately in the temple. Then Gamaliel, a Pharisee of great reputation, advised in the high Council a wise and merciful policy of delay. It was best to see first what would come of the thing. This advice prevailed so far that the Sanhedrim dismissed the apostles after they had been punished with scourging, and again forbidden to preach Jesus. With the principle of this order they

[1] Acts v. 12, 13. [2] Acts v. 15.

did not comply, and now broke out the storm of a general and systematic persecution.[1]

Among the seven men who had been entrusted with the newly-established office of the diaconate, for the care of the poor, Stephen ranked first in power and in spiritual gifts. Himself a Hellenist, he had come into contact as a messenger of Christ with Hellenistic Jews from Italy, Cyrene, Egypt, Cilicia and the coasts of Asia, and had exercised a powerful influence over them. His adversaries among these Hellenists accused him before the Sanhedrim, bringing witnesses to prove that he had blasphemed the law and the temple; that is, he had spoken of the approaching fall of the temple and the abolition or reformation of the ceremonial law by a Divine judgment. In his defence he drew a picture of the past history and divine guidance of Israel, that he might exhibit to them, as in a mirror, their own conduct in that of their forefathers against the prophets sent from God, and at the same time point out how the preparatory course of God's counsels had found its destined end in the mission of the Messiah. But when he passed on to a fiery exhortation to repentance, and told them the same spirit of obstinate disobedience and faithlessness which their fathers showed ruled in them too, and had driven them to betray and murder the Righteous One; when he cried out in an ecstatic vision of the glory of Christ, "I see the heavens opened, and the Son of Man standing at the right hand of God," they treated this as a fresh blasphemy, and dragged him

[1] Acts v. 17—42.

forth in wild tumult, without any formal sentence, to be stoned, according to the law of the Zealots. Thus died the first Martyr, praying for his enemies after his Master's example.[1] The favour they had before found with the people could no longer protect any disciple of Christ; when once the word "blasphemy" had gone forth, the Pharisees reganied all their old influence over the people, who were ready to give up the Christians to their will, or even to help in executing punishment on them.

The great persecution in Jerusalem dispersed most of the believers over the provinces of Judæa and Samaria, and even drove them further to Phœnicia, Cyprus, and Antioch;[2] that the apostles, who were chiefly threatened, remained at Jerusalem, showed that they had received a special command of Christ to do so. The Samaritans, that mongrel race, half Jew half Gentile, hated and shunned as unclean by the Jews, were the first to benefit by the dispersion of the Christians; their country was the first stage of a mission now for the first time over-stepping the limits of Jewish nationality. The deacon, Philip, who baptized a foreign proselyte of the gate, the chamberlain of the queen of Meroe, worked among them with very happy results, and reaped the harvest which Christ Himself had sown earlier.[3] Peter and John were sent by the Apostolic College to impart confirmation to those he baptized, through prayer and the laying on of hands, and with it the visible gifts of the Holy Ghost which then so often accompanied it.

[1] Acts vii. 59. [2] Acts viii. 1—7; xi. 19. [3] John iv. 35—38.

Without such a testimony the Jewish believers would have been very slow to understand that this bastard brother of the chosen people was called to enter the Church. The extraordinary effects of this communication of the Spirit led the Samaritan magician, Simon, to imagine that the apostles possessed a magical power, exercised through the laying on of hands, the use of which they could impart to others, and that they would sell the secret of it for money. Peter's threatening rebuke so terrified him that he besought the apostles to pray to God for him.[1] But it must not be supposed that this was any real conversion; he played the part of a miracle-monger and head of a sect to the last.

With the exception of its being received in Samaria, the Gospel as yet was only preached to the children of Abraham. There was no beginning even made as yet of a fulfilment of the promises given long before Christ that the heathen also were to enter into the kingdom of God, and of His own general command to the apostles to teach and baptize all peoples. It must have seemed to those who considered the events taking place in the bosom of Judaism, as though the whole of that great movement which had originated with Christ were to be confined within the limits of Israel, and the impenetrable wall of partition which contemporary custom, even more than the written law, had built up between the Jews and the rest of mankind, was to remain even for the disciples of Jesus.

The apostles knew, in a general way, God's decree as

[1] Acts viii. 18—24.

to the call of the Gentiles: but they were not clear as to its precise time or conditions. Were those Gentiles only to be received who were already "proselytes of righteousness," or those who had submitted to circumcision and the whole Jewish law? The law of Moses had enjoined circumcision as a permanent and constantly binding obligation; the uncircumcised was to be rooted out of the people of God. And the apostles foresaw that to relax this condition by admitting him to communion among born Jews would certainly give the greatest offence, and be a serious hindrance to the further spread of the faith among them. It needed a divine revelation to overcome the scruples and hesitation of the apostles, and accordingly one was given to Peter, who was destined, as head of the Church, to admit the first Gentiles.

There were at that time many Gentiles everywhere, who, in the eyes of the Jews, were half converts, like those earlier "proselytes of the gate," who were not required to observe the whole law, but only to abstain from certain heathen practices. These "God-fearing" Gentiles used to observe the hours of prayer in the temple, and attended the service at the Synagogues, but, being uncircumcised, were regarded and treated by the Jews as unclean, and they would not eat or drink or hold any familiar intercourse with them. Such a half proselyte was the centurion Cornelius, who belonged to the Italian cohort quartered at Cæsarea. He had already won the very highest character among the Israelites far and near by his unfeigned piety, which

his whole family shared, and by his gentleness. This was the man chosen out by Divine Providence to be an example and evidence of the breaking down and entire removal of the partition-wall between different nations. And so, while Cornelius was warned by an angel to send for Peter, the apostle, too, was set free, by a special divine interposition, from the notion sucked in from his youth, on which the separation of Jew and Gentile chiefly rested, the notion, namely, that every uncircumcised man was unclean, and all intercourse with him defiling. For it was the law about food, which discriminated between clean and unclean meats, that kept alive the aversion of the Jews for any intercourse with foreigners, who through tasting unclean animals had themselves become unclean.[1] Therefore, when Peter was hungry, a sheet coming down from heaven was shown to him in vision full of clean and unclean animals, and when he hesitated to comply with the command, "Kill and eat," because he had never eaten anything unclean, he was told that what God had cleansed he must not treat as unclean, and thus he learnt that the Supreme Lawgiver Himself, who had before marked out and given for food only certain kinds of animals, now withdrew that distinction, and allowed all animals indifferently to be eaten. The further meaning of the vision was clear to him, when the messengers of Cornelius appeared directly after-

[1] So the Jews themselves explained the aim and operation of the Mosaic law about meats. See Eleazer's speech, Euseb. *Præp. Ev.* viii. 9.

wards, and so he had no scruple about accepting their invitation.[1] When he found from the words of Cornelius how wonderfully the two visions fitted into each other, it became clear to him for the first time that God did not vouchsafe His grace only to the children of Abraham, as he had hitherto believed with his countrymen, but that among other nations, too, the fear of God and practical piety were pleasing to Him, and that He was calling those who served Him, though not Jews, to believe and enter His Church. And now followed an occurrence which could not but remove the last lingering scruples of Peter's Jewish attendants; God Himself showed that He had made these Gentiles members of Christ, independently of the ministry of the apostle who was summoned for the purpose. For, before they were baptized and had received the laying on of hands, while they were listening to Peter's words, the Holy Ghost came upon them, and they spoke with tongues and praised God. Thus was the same privilege accorded to the first fruits of the Gentiles, which had been the glory of the first fruits of Israel at Pentecost. They were at once baptized by Peter's direction; and thus God had Himself reversed in some sense the usual order of His grace, by bestowing on the unbaptized the gifts of the Holy Ghost, to meet the popular error of the Jews that the promises were given only to them to the exclusion of the Gentiles, and to show that He had called these, too, to the faith and privileges of the New Testament. When the believers

[1] Acts x. 13.

at Jerusalem received Peter with reproaches for having associated and eaten with the uncircumcised, he justified himself by simply relating what had occurred, which showed clearly the immediate interposition of God, and by reminding them of Christ's promise, that His followers should be baptized with the Holy Ghost, which was here fulfilled.

If the conversion of the Gentile family at Cæsarea was an isolated event, a whole community of Gentile converts was founded at the same time in the Eastern capital of the Empire, which had also a great number of Jewish inhabitants, and thus the admission of the uncircumcised into the Church of Christ became a recognised procedure. The Cyprian and Cyrenaic Hellenists, driven out of Jerusalem by the persecution, preached Christ with great success to the Greeks of Antioch on the Orontes. Barnabas, of Cyprus, who was sent from Jerusalem to take charge of these first instalments of a Gentile Christian community, perceived that a wide field for work lay open there, and therefore fetched an assistant from Tarsus, whose marvellous greatness and importance in the world's history he himself did not yet conjecture. They worked together there for a year. Antioch, from the size of the city and personal standing of the men who laboured there to build up the Christian society, became the second Christian metropolis and Mother Church, which, consisting chiefly of Gentile converts, took its place beside the Mother Church of Jerusalem, consisting wholly of Jewish converts. Here the name of Chris-

tian was first given to believers, probably by the Latin portion of the Gentile population, in derision.

Meanwhile the Church had obtained through a miraculous call and conversion the man chosen above all to break down the partition wall between Jew and Gentile, and to bring the latter in a body into the new communion.

A young man of Tarsus, Saul by name, had distinguished himself above all by his burning zeal against the disciples of Christ, and his unwearied energy in extirpating them. The son of a Pharisee, he had been educated at Jerusalem in the school of Gamaliel, the most learned and pious doctor of the Law of the day, and was firmly grounded in the prevalent doctrine about the approaching glorification of the Law and erection of the Kingdom of Israel. He had inherited from his father the important and valuable privileges of Roman citizenship; and, belonging as he did to a city which could even compete with Athens and Alexandria as a chief seat of Greek civilization and science, was not unacquainted with Greek literature, though it had done nothing to subdue the rigour of his Pharisaic zeal for the Law.

Saul, as he was called in Hebrew, or Paul after the Hellenistic form of his name, was a witness of the heroic resignation and magnanimous constancy with which Stephen had suffered death. And that event may have left a sting in his breast which afterwards contributed to his conversion, though for the time it only confirmed him in the conviction that a sect which

produced such martyrs constituted a grave danger to pure Judaism, distracted as it was otherwise from within and threatened more and more seriously from without, and that it must, therefore, be extirpated. He hastened to Damascus, whither many Christians had fled, with full powers from the high priest, the president of the Sanhedrim, to superintend the imprisonment of the apostates.

But in the persecutor of to-day was hidden the Apostle of to-morrow, as the generous fruit is hidden in its rough shell. When he was certain that the promised Deliverer of Israel, whom he with all his people was looking for, had already come, and come in the person of Jesus, then that stream of fiery zeal poured itself into the bed of the young Church; that fulness of acquirements, that strength of mind and will came over to the service of the cause he had hitherto hated and persecuted. This certainty he gained on his way to Damascus; he suddenly heard the voice of the Lord and saw His countenance, and the favour granted during the forty days to the apostles and disciples was also conferred on him; the risen Jesus appeared to Him, not, as to them, with shrouded majesty, but in the splendour and brightness of His glorified Humanity. To him alone was this sight vouchsafed, while his companions perceived, indeed, the light outshining the mid-day sun and heard the sound of a voice, but neither saw Jesus nor understood the words spoken. Saul, struck to the ground at the presence of the Lord, and then raised up again by His word, learnt now that he,

the former persecutor, was ordained to preach and testify what he had hitherto denied and abhorred as blasphemy. When the vision was over, he observed that he had lost his sight. He was led on by his attendants the little way still left to Damascus, and remained three days blind, eating and drinking nothing; but his spiritual sight was all the keener in this night of his outward senses. The illusions which had before held captive this lofty and powerful spirit vanished now; the prophetic passages of Scripture became clear to him, and the look of the dying Stephen rose before his soul. In those three days he lived whole years of penitence, and recognized himself as the chief of sinners;[1] the proud self-righteousness of the Pharisee, which deemed itself blameless in observing all the externals of the Law, fell, like a hard crust, from his heart; belief in Jesus, whose disciples he had compelled to blaspheme Him, entered and began at once to transform his whole consciousness. A believer at Damascus, named Ananias, to whom even the Jews bore testimony as a conscientious observer of the Law, had already been commanded in a vision to restore sight, by laying on of hands, to the enemy and threatening persecutor, whose mere name filled him with fear and anxiety, but who was even now absorbed in prayer, and thus showed that he had grown humble and obedient. As Peter and Cornelius had been prepared for their intercourse with each other by similar visions, so, while Ananias received this summons, Saul was instructed by a vision that

[1] Tim. i. 15. Eph. iii. 8.

Ananias would come and cure him of his blindness. And thus Saul was received into the bosom of the Church by baptism, and preached Jesus in the synagogue of the city.[1]

Not for long however—that the Jews at Damascus, where they had full power against an apostate from their own ranks, would not have tolerated. Saul did not return to Jerusalem, but went into Arabia,[2] either that part of the Arabian desert which stretches to the Gardens of Damascus, or into Arabia Petræa touching on Syria and Egypt, not to preach there, but to prepare in solitary intercourse with God for the duties of his future life, to obtain through converse with his glorified Redeemer that fitness for the apostolate which the other apostles had gained from their converse with Christ on earth. Even the Lord Himself, after His baptism and before entering on His ministry, had been driven by the Spirit into the wilderness. When Saul after a short absence reappeared in Damascus, the Jews sought to kill him. They had won over the governor under King Aretas who then ruled the city, and he gave orders to arrest him, while they watched the gates that the hated renegade might not escape. But the believers let him down over the walls by night in a basket. And now, in the third year after his conversion, he went for the first time to Jerusalem.[3]

Paul himself insisted afterwards on the fact that he had not after his miraculous enlightening submitted to human influence or to human trial and approval, and

[1] Acts ix. 9—22. [2] Gal. i. 17. [3] 2 Cor. xi 32, 33.

had on that account not gone sooner to Jerusalem, because, being under the personal teaching and guidance of the glorified Jesus, he had no need of such aid, or of any earthly attestation.[1] His gospel, as he had received it immediately from God, left no room for doubt or for correction or addition from men, not even from the apostles themselves. What took him now to Jerusalem was the desire to become better acquainted with the first and chiefest of the apostles, whom Christ Himself had made the Shepherd of His flock, and to hold converse with him. It was the Cyprian Barnabas who introduced him to the apostles, that is to Peter and James, the bishop of Jerusalem;—the rest he did not then see. The believers there had heard nothing of the events at Damascus, and accordingly looked with fear and suspicion on a man who shortly before was their bitter enemy, but now gave himself out as one of them. They were convinced, however, of the earnestness and reality of his conversion by the word of Barnabas, and not less by the hatred which instigated the Hellenistic Jews to seek his life. After spending fifteen days with Peter he left Jerusalem and went to Tarsus, accompanied as far as Cæsarea by friends who were apprehensive for his life; soon after, on a summons from Barnabas, he went to Antioch.

A common contribution which the new converts at Antioch sent to their Jewish fellow Christians at Jerusalem, in consequence of a famine, took Barnabas and Saul again to the capital of Judæa.[2] The hatred of the

[1] Gal. i. 17. [2] Acts xi. 27 30.

Synagogue against the poor and insignificant little flock of believers was in full force there; but they avoided exciting observation, and were the better able to remain concealed as they assiduously attended the temple and joined in the religious solemnities of the Jews. The High priests and Sanhedrim were willing enough then to avoid attracting the attention of the Roman authorities to their own internal affairs by persecuting others; and were otherwise sufficiently occupied and kept on the stretch, first by the attempt of Caligula, to put up his image in the temple, and then by the policy of the Roman governor of not leaving the same high-priest long in office but changing them oftener, so as to keep alive the jealousy between Pharisees and Sadducees. But when Paul came the second time to Jerusalem (A.D. 44), they had again a king of their own, Herod Agrippa, grandson of Herod the Great, who might be regarded as belonging to their nation, for he had the blood of the old Hasmoneans in his veins. He wished to solve the difficult problem of at once making himself popular with his people and standing well with the Roman authorities; and therefore he too kept the high-priests strictly dependent on him by frequent changes, but gave over the believers to the hatred of priests and people. Again was the Easter season the time selected for the execution of punishment; James the son of Zebedee, brother of John, was the first martyr among the apostles; Peter was kept in prison, that his death might serve as a welcome spectacle at the close of the festival. But he was set free at night by an angel, and showed himself to the assemblage of believers who

were praying for him in Mary's house and were seized with joyful astonishment, bade them inform James the son of Alphæus and the rest of the brethren of his release, and immediately left Jerusalem, where from this time only James remained, as bishop of the community. The Church, however, was soon delivered from the enmity of Herod by a death which, from its terrible circumstances, appeared to the believers as a judgment of God on the persecutor.[1]

Several years had now elapsed since Paul's conversion, yet he never took more than a subordinate position in the Church, and in the rank of those engaged in the ministry. The enlightened prophets and teachers who were then in the Church at Antioch are named in the Acts of the Apostles, first Barnabas, then Simeon Niger, Lucius of Cyrene, Manaen, foster brother of Herod the tetrarch; and lastly Saul. It was some time after his return from his second journey to Jerusalem with Barnabas that he was first raised, together with Barnabas, to the apostolic office, according to previous announcement. While the persons just named were keeping a fast and discharging their priestly functions, the divine command went forth, either by the mouth of one of the prophets present or by an inspiration of several, to separate Barnabas and Saul for the work to which the Lord had called them; and this was done by prayer and the laying on of hands. This was no conferring of apostleship on their part; the apostles themselves had received no power from Christ to do that. Both the vocation to the apostolate and its bestowal,

[1] Acts xii. 1—23.

could only come direct from God. In the election of Matthias, the only matter dealt with was the filling up the complete number of the Twelve which had been so appointed and fixed by Christ.[1] Nor can we say that Saul and Barnabas were called to a new and hitherto non-existent kind of apostolate, that of the Gentiles, for there was no such division of apostolic action for Jews and Gentiles, and the new apostles themselves always turned first to the Jews. The most probable account to be given of the matter is this:—Barnabas and Saul were appointed to fill up two vacant places in the apostolic college, one caused by the sword of Herod in the execution of James son of Zebedee, the other by James son of Alphæus being withdrawn from the peculiar work of an apostle, without of course losing the dignity, through his position as bishop of Jerusalem after all the other apostles had left the city to carry the preaching of the gospel into more distant lands. And thus, by the entrance of Saul and Barnabas into the body of apostles, the number of those exercising the apostolic mission was restored to its normal condition of Twelve. That Barnabas in particular was made an apostle in just as strict a sense of the word as Paul, is a matter there can be no mistake about. Paul places him with himself on a par with the other apostles.[2] Luke never gives Paul alone the title of apostle, but always with Barnabas, and that first after the ordination at Antioch, which so far constitutes a turning-point in his narrative that, whereas before it he always men-

[1] Matt. xix. 28. [2] 1 Cor. ix. 5, 6.

tions Barnabas first, afterwards he mentions Paul first.[1] The Greek no less than the Western Church honours Barnabas as an apostle, and Jerome reckons him and Paul as the thirteenth and fourteenth apostles. And thus the apostolic College has always consisted of Twelve only at a time, but of fourteen men successively;[2] and therefore the Apocalypse knows only of Twelve Apostles as foundation stones of the walls of the holy City.[3]

Since the call to the apostolate must come immediately from God, Paul received his appointment to preach the gospel to the Gentiles in another appearance and revelation of Christ, vouchsafed to him in an ecstasy in the temple during his second visit to the Jewish capital, and in this apostolate Barnabas was united to him through a manifestation of the Divine will at Antioch. Hence he appeals, as against the objections of the Galatians, to the direct bestowal of his apostolic office by God, and its consequent equality to that of the rest; he was to preach his gospel without having learnt it from any one, without asking any one first and getting their consent. If he sought out the apostle Peter during his short stay in Jerusalem, that was only to show honour to his primacy, not to receive instruction from him, which he needed not, or power and mission, which he already possessed. Paul and Barnabas, though specially called to the Gentile apostolate, always recognised the prior right of the Jews by preaching Christ first to them on their journeys. The Synagogues were the places

[1] Acts xv. 25. [2] [Or rather of fifteen, reckoning Judas.—Tr.]
[3] Apoc. xxi. 14.

where Paul appeared, the rather since a number of "God-fearing" Gentiles, proselytes of the gate, were always among their members, who formed the bridge whereby Christ's message might reach the unbelieving Gentiles also.[1]

In the year 45, immediately after entering on their apostleship, Paul and Barnabas undertook a first missionary journey to Cyprus and the Southern provinces of Asia Minor, which had great results.[2] But on their return to Antioch the quarrel with the Judaizers broke out, which henceforth through the whole apostolic age was the sorest trial of the infant church and the grand difficulty especially which Paul had to contend with. The conduct of both apostles in inviting Gentiles at once to enter the Jewish Christian community, without any regard to law, defilement, or separation, was something shocking and intolerable to the great body of Jews as then minded. The sons of Abraham and their lofty privileges would be swallowed up, as it were, at no distant period by the mass of Gentile believers. This anxiety was felt above all in Jerusalem where the temple and Levitical service were constantly before men's eyes. The affair of Cornelius was an isolated case, an exception to the rule, acquiesced in as having received the seal of divine approval through the miraculous outpouring of the gifts of the Spirit on those Gentiles; but now that communities were being formed consisting wholly or chiefly of Gentile converts, the greatness of the danger was conspicuous. And certain "false brethren who had

[1] Gal. i. 15—19. Acts xiii. 5, 14. [2] Acts xiii. xiv.

crept in secretly" appeared at Antioch, intending to force the yoke of the Mosaic law on the new converts.

The Ceremonial Law had its stronghold and the guarantee of its continuance in the existence of the Jewish polity. So long as this and the temple stood it was idle to think of abolishing the law; or at least its abolition could only have come about through a general and simultaneous entrance of the Jewish nation, as well its lower as its higher classes, into the Church. For the ceremonial was also a civil law; the Jew was bound to its observance not only as an individual, but above all as a member of the state and nation; nor was there any command of the Lord to the individual believer to separate from his people and its Church and State organisation. Moreover, in Judæa and Galilee it was impossible to do so without emigrating. But even the Jews of the Dispersion always regarded themselves as members of the Commonwealth which had its seat and centre at Jerusalem, and sent their contributions thither. Thus it was not left to the caprice of the believers in Judæa whether they would observe the ceremonial law or not, but was for them a necessity. Meanwhile, until the counsel of God was more broadly and clearly developed, they remained in the fullest sense Israelites, only distinguished in the one point of their believing that Messiah had already come, but willingly conforming in all other respects to the existing order of the law.

The apostles on their side did not venture to do anything which might impede the grand vocation of the whole nation to become pillars and instruments of the

religion of Messiah—a vocation not yet definitively rejected, nor had the interval permitted for accepting it yet expired. They did not venture to introduce or abolish anything at the risk of needlessly repelling the great body of the Jews, and were bound to sustain carefully all the fibres by which the Christian community was attached to the great Jewish national Church and State. They accordingly continued to observe the law themselves, and tolerated and approved its observance in the Jewish Christian communities.

The Christian zealots for the law who came from Jerusalem to Antioch declared to the Gentile converts: "Unless you are circumcised you cannot be saved."[1] This was going beyond even the prevalent Jewish view of the period, for there was a large body of "Proselytes of the gate" who were not required to keep the ceremonial law. But had it been announced in the name of the Synagogue that there was no salvation without being circumcised, of course no Gentile would have become a proselyte of this kind; he would either have remained a Heathen or become a "Proselyte of righteousness;" but this latter class was comparatively a small one. Only a few zealots among the Jews considered circumcision absolutely indispensable, like that Eleazer who represented to king Izates of Adiabene the danger to his soul of not being circumcised, while the Jewish merchant Ananias had dissuaded him from circumcision, because he could please God without it.[2] The view of these Pharisee converts was that not only belief in Christ

[1] Acts xv. 1. [2] Joseph. *Arch.* xxii. 2, 5.

as the promised Messiah but also observance of the ritual law was a condition of salvation, that Christ had come for the very purpose of confirming the Law and enlarging the circle of its adherents, and that since His kingdom had begun the time of patience and forbearance with "God fearing" Gentiles was over; so that whoever would be saved must become a full citizen of Israel strengthened by the addition and incorporation of Gentile converts.

Here, then, was a very grave practical difficulty. It was not easy to see how a brotherly relationship and healthy intercourse of common life could grow up between Gentile and Jewish Christians, the circumcised and uncircumcised. For the strict ceremonialist would not eat and drink with the uncircumcised; the law of meats prevented him. Here, in fact, was a knot which could not really be untied or cut, except by the direct intervention of Divine Providence. Meanwhile, as the claims of the two parties could not be thoroughly reconciled, some temporary accommodation had to be devised.

Paul and Barnabas, therefore, with certain others, including Titus, a learned Greek who had joined Paul, went at this time to Jerusalem commissioned by the Church at Antioch to get this difficult question settled. It was Paul's third journey to the capital since his conversion, and fourteen years after it. He has given us an account of it in his Epistle to the Galatians, but only so far as regards the recognition of his apostolate and preaching of the Gospel by the chief apostles there. When representing himself to the Galatians, in proof of

his apostolic authority, as being under the immediate guidance and enlightenment of the Lord, he refers this journey to a special revelation. It was resolved on Peter's proposal, in an assembly where he and James were present together with the presbyters of the Church, that the burden of circumcision and the law should not be laid on Gentile converts. But in order to facilitate a real fusion of Jews and Gentiles in the Church, the latter were to abstain from certain things peculiarly repulsive to the Jews, viz., from sharing in Heathen sacrificial feasts, and eating blood or the flesh of strangled animals. The apostles felt the more bound to require the observance of these restrictions, as it was a matter causing offence to the Jews and making Christianity appear to them a religion beset with Heathen abominations. It was thought necessary in Jerusalem to add the prohibition of "fornication," because impurity and sins of the flesh were so common and so little regarded among the Heathen that much of this sort might also survive among converts from Heathenism.[1]

Paul had communicated to the three apostles at a private interview his manner of procedure in preaching to the Gentiles, probably before the public meeting; not, as he says, to gain instruction from them—for he did what he did by divine inspiration—but to gain the confirmation and sanction of their authority. He had already successfully resisted the demands of the Christian Pharisees that his attendant, Titus, a converted

[1] Acts xv. Gal. ii. 1—10.

Greek, should be circumcised. The apostles had nothing to object to the conduct and teaching of Paul, which they found all perfectly regular, and made a brotherly covenant with him, acknowledging that, as Peter had been prepared and blessed by God for the work of converting the Jews, so Paul was a chosen instrument for winning the Gentiles. They agreed, therefore, to work according to a mutual understanding, Peter James and John devoting themselves principally to preaching the gospel to the circumcised, while Paul and Barnabas worked as apostles of the Gentiles.[1] But this did not hinder Paul from labouring with unwearied zeal to win his countrymen to faith in Christ, or withdraw Peter and John from preaching to the Gentiles when opportunity offered. All communities already founded, or now growing up beyond the limits of Judæa, were composed of both Jews and Gentiles, so that every apostle who did not remain in Judea, like James, must attend to both. At the same time whatever communities Paul and Barnabas might found were to be connected with the Church at Jerusalem, and testify their relation to it as daughters by sending contributions for the poor there.

The worst was thus averted, and the Christian liberty of Gentile converts secured; but the main difficulty remained unsolved, and was purposely not touched upon at the Council. It was tacitly assumed that the Jewish Christians and the apostles themselves would continue to observe the law. But how was a real

[1] Gal. ii. 6—9.

Church communion to come about while the Israelite held a converted and baptized Greek for an unclean being, with whom it was defilement to eat and drink? Without doubt the apostles intended the requirements of the Jewish law to yield here to the higher duties of Christian brotherly love, and the better claims of membership in the body of the Church. In Judæa, where the Christian societies were purely Jewish, there was no opportunity for exhibiting this in practice; but soon after the apostolic Council Peter had an opportunity of doing so while staying at Antioch with Paul and Barnabas. In that city, where the Jewish law was not the law of the land, he had no scruple about "living as a Gentile;" *i.e.*, associating at table and in domestic life with Gentiles, until some Jewish Christians arrived there from James' communion at Jerusalem. And then, to avoid offending them and damaging his influence among the Jews of Palestine, he thought it right to withdraw from eating with Gentile converts. All the Jewish Christians at Antioch—Barnabas among them—followed his example. This was no violation of the rule laid down by the Council, for the whole question was left unsettled there, and whoever disregarded this part of the law was, in the eyes of all Jews, a complete breaker of the law. Peter, therefore, might well think that, being compelled to choose between the Gentiles and the Jews, he had better take the lesser evil of the two. As Paul says, he feared those of the circumcision.[1] This was no want of moral

[1] Gal. ii. 11—14.

courage, of which he had given abundant proof in more than once upbraiding all Jerusalem and its rulers with their sin against the Lord, in opening the Church's gates to the first Gentile family, and in being the first at the Council to recognise Gentile liberties. But he remembered that the Jewish Christians of Palestine belonged to the Jewish civil polity, still existing, though dependent on Rome, and based entirely on the Mosaic law; he knew that law,—social, ritual, and political,—to be the law of the land, from which Christians could not withdraw themselves while continuing to be citizens and residents in the country. He had rightly preferred regard for his Gentile brethren to observance of the law while living at Antioch beyond the jurisdiction of the Jewish state. But the arrival of Jewish Christians from Jerusalem placed him in a dilemma between opposite duties and relations, his old duty to his fellow-countrymen, converted chiefly by him, and bound by the law of separation, and his new duty to brethren gained over by others. As the Shepherd appointed by Christ for the whole flock, he belonged to both, but he had hitherto been peculiarly the apostle of Israel, and was not willing to give up his labours in Jerusalem and Judæa; he wished especially to preserve his authority and influence where born Jews predominated. He had, indeed, already broken through the partition wall by the baptism of Cornelius, and maintained his right to do so against the scruples of others; but then he could appeal to the fire baptism of the Spirit and miraculous gifts, whereby God Himself attested that the Gentiles

were no more unclean or inferior to Jewish believers. No such event had occurred at Antioch.

But Peter had himself declared at the Council that the ritual law was a yoke neither the Jews nor their fathers had been able to bear, he had first, as Paul said, "though a Jew lived as a Gentile," yet he now assumed an attitude which, from his position in the Church, amounted to putting on Gentile converts a moral compulsion to submit to the yoke of the law. For if he, the pillar of legitimate unity chosen by Christ as shepherd of the flock, showed by his actions that he held the uncircumcised unclean, their persons and their meats defiling, they could only infer that to be admitted to communion with the Head of the Church, they must sacrifice the liberty guaranteed to them by the Council and adopt the law. That was intolerable to Paul as Apostle of the Gentiles and preacher of Evangelical freedom, and he thought, too, how the Pharisee zealots who wanted to impose the whole law on Gentiles would abuse this example of the chief apostle. He openly and sharply censured Peter for building up again what he had pulled down, and, after he had already by his conduct vindicated Gentiles from the obligation of the law, acting now from fear of men against his better judgment; that was "hypocrisy." We are not told Peter's reply, but there was no lasting quarrel, for in the thing itself both apostles were agreed. Paul never thought of urging Jews in general, especially those in Palestine, to renounce the law altogether, of requiring them, *e.g.*, not to circumcise their children; he acknowledged that they

must keep it as long as the present State and Church organization of the Jewish people lasted. The great separation was not yet come, the Jew who believed in Christ remained a member of his nation and shared its duties as also its rights and privileges. When the key-stone which held all together was broken to pieces, when the national sanctuary of the temple was destroyed by a higher interposition, then the links of the chain would be severed and the converted son of Abraham would belong only to the Church, and no more to his people and to the Synagogue. Paul himself, therefore, felt no hesitation about observing the law, when it did not come into collision with the higher duties of his apostolate and his position towards the Gentile Christians, as when he had Timothy, the son of a Jewish mother and Greek father, circumcised, and bore the charges of a Nazarite vow.[1] He was only zealous against it when it was substituted for faith in Christ, and had a value given it in the conscience as the means of man's justification before God, and when, as was only possible from this false stand-point, its yoke was to be laid on the necks of Gentile Christians. Such an attempt he thought was involved indirectly in the behaviour of Peter. On the other hand, Peter and Barnabas thought they had full freedom of conscience to observe or neglect the ritual law as a thing indifferent in itself, and in the impossibility of doing justice to both parties they believed that they ought to give the preference to their countrymen. This can be more naturally and

[1] Acts xxi. 23—26.

easily justified in Peter than in Barnabas the Cypriote. Peter saw in converted Israel the germ of the Church, to which the Gentile Christians belonged only as guests arrived later, and to their good all other considerations must yield; he knew that nothing could be more prejudicial to the success of his work in Jerusalem and Judæa than his being known to have broken through the fence which guarded to ritual purity of Judaism.

This dispute appears to have led to a temporary separation between Paul and Barnabas, for when the latter wanted to take his kinsman, Mark, with him on the missionary journey arranged already with Paul, Paul opposed it because he had previously left them in Pamphylia from love of ease.[1] The fact of Mark, who was intimately allied to Peter, having followed his example and that of Barnabas, in separating from the Gentile Christians, may have helped to form Paul's decision. On this account the two apostles of the Gentiles, who had hitherto worked in union, parted. Barnabas went with Mark to his native Cyprus; Paul, accompanied by Silas, entered on his second great missionary journey. He visited the communities in Syria, Cilicia, and Lycaonia, took up the young Timothy in Lystra, and soon afterwards, as appears from the changed tone of the narrative, must have also been joined by the Evangelist Luke. Paul, who at Jerusalem had refused the requisition of the legal zealots to get Titus circumcised, on the other hand induced Timothy to undergo the rite;[2] for he wished

[1] Acts xv. 36—41. [2] Acts xvi. 3.

to make use of him for preaching the gospel in the Synagogues and Jewish houses. From this period the other apostles for a long time retire into the background, and nothing is known to us of their operations. Paul is now the leading person whose history, up to his imprisonment at Rome, forms the subject of the second part of Luke's narrative.

After staying a long while in Galatia, Paul, being warned in a dream, went over with his three companions from Troas to Macedonia, and thus the Gospel for the first time touched the soil of Europe. In spite of the ill-treatment they suffered the apostles founded flourishing communities at Philippi, Thessalonica, and Berœa; the first of these he named afterwards his joy and his crown.[1] In Thessalonica he was allowed to preach Jesus for three weeks in the Synagogue, but at last the Jews stirred up the multitude against him, and when the Jews at Berœa showed more readiness to receive him, he was soon turned out from thence, too, in an uproar organised by Jews who came over from Thessalonica. The believers made him fly to Athens.[2] There, among a light-minded people, and surrounded by the highest artistic splendour of the Heathen world, he did not find a favourable soil; Epicureans and Stoics mocked him and his crucified Nazarene; the one called him a babbler, the others scornfully thought he wanted to introduce two new gods, Jesus and the Resurrection. Meanwhile the speech on the Areopagus was not without effect, where he alluded to an altar erected to the

[1] Phil. i. 3—8; iv. 1. [2] Acts xvii. 11—15.

"unknown God," in order to proclaim to the Athenians this nameless, and as yet to them unknown God. Some persons were converted, and among them Dionysius the Areopagite, first Bishop of Athens.

He found a more productive field opened to him in the wealthy and luxurious commercial city of Corinth, where he staid a year and a half, living in the house of the Jew Aquila, one of his own trade, as a carpet-maker on his own earnings, for he had, according to the Jewish custom, learnt this trade with his studies. A numerous community was the result of his preachings. In Corinth, as elsewhere, he turned first to the Jews and the proselytes belonging to their Synagogue; but he met with violent opposition from the majority. He, therefore, turned his back on the Synagogue, and held his meetings in the neighbouring house of a proselyte, Justus. His successes were great among the Gentiles, especially the lower classes; and the director of the Synagogue, Crispus, was himself converted with his whole family. It was in vain that the Jews brought him before the tribunal of the pro-consul, Gallio, as a troubler of their religion. They were driven away.

During his first stay at Corinth Paul wrote his first epistle, that to the Thessalonians, about the year 52; and soon after a second, full of desire to see them again. Timothy, who had been sent thither from Athens, had brought back a favourable report, on the whole, of the condition of the community; their firmness in the faith under severe trials was already spoken of far and wide. Paul said they were models for the believers in Mace-

donia and Achaia; their Church constitution was already in order; they had presbyters, and spiritual gifts, especially that of prophecy, were not wanting. But a dark side of the picture is, that the imagination of Christians there had fixed itself eagerly on the notion of the near approach of Christ's second coming; they thought this return of the Lord to accomplish His kingdom on earth was close at hand, and this expectation dominated their whole attitude of mind and kept other Christian truths in the background. The consequence was that not a few, giving themselves over to visionary anticipations, relinquished or neglected the business of their calling, and frittered away their energies in idleness or in busying themselves without any definite aim.[1] The apostle attacked this error by representing to them in his First Epistle that the time of the Second Advent could not be fixed, for the Lord would come unexpectedly, as a thief in the night, but for the salvation of the watchful. He, at the same time, contradicted the notion that at the Second Coming the dead would be worse off than those alive.

Meanwhile, in Thessalonica itself, a forged letter of Paul's had been circulated to confirm this expectation; and he therefore took pains in his Second Epistle to bring them back to a quiet and sensible state of mind, by pointing to certain signs which must precede the Second Coming of Christ. As he here referred to declarations he had made before by word of mouth, so his expressions in this Epistle are partly only dark

[1] 1 Thess. iv. 10, 11; 2 Thess. iii. 8.

hints, for he himself felt the hope recur to him, that he might yet live to see the second appearance of Christ. Later he wrote to the Philippians, that he desired to die in order to be with Christ.[1]

After a stay of a year and a half Paul left Corinth, the greatest and most flourishing of the communities he had founded. He wished to perform a vow by bringing an offering to Jerusalem, for which reason he shaved his head at the harbour of Cenchrea, after the Jewish manner in such cases.[2] His road took him to the flourishing commercial city of Ephesus, with its numerous Jewish population, who would gladly have detained him, but he wished to be at Jerusalem for the approaching feast on account of his vow; and he seems this time to have soon taken his departure, after a short stay and hasty salutation of the Church. After a visit to Antioch and the previously converted Galatian communities, he returned for a longer stay to Ephesus. Not only was one of the most important Christian communities established here, principally by his means, but from this centre, which, from its commercial connections, offered abundant opportunities of intercourse, he propagated Christianity in other parts of Asia Minor, partly in person, partly through his assistants.

The Alexandrian Jew, Apollos, an eloquent man and well versed in the Scriptures, had already been at Ephesus before Paul; but he had only been instructed

[1] Phil. i. 23 Cf. 1 Thess. iv. 16, 17.

[2] Acts xviii. 18. No one who understands Luke's manner of speaking in the Acts can possibly refer the words in question to Aquila.

by John's disciples, and knew nothing of Christian baptism as distinct from that of John, though he preached Jesus as the Messiah. After receiving fuller instruction from Paul's friends, Aquila and Priscilla, he went to Corinth with letters of introduction, taught there with great success, and returned from thence to Ephesus in company with Paul.[1] He himself found twelve disciples in the city there who had only received John's baptism, and knew nothing of the communication of the Holy Ghost and His gifts; he had them baptized, and confirmed them by the laying on of hands, on which they at once spoke with tongues and prophesied.[2]

Here, too, the Apostle was obliged after awhile to withdraw from the public Synagogue, and retire with his Christians into the private synagogue of Tyrannus. His personal presence, his teaching, the cures which here especially he worked on large numbers of the sick and the demoniacs,—all this created a great sensation at Ephesus, and it was increased by a remarkable occurrence which took place. Some Jewish exorcists, sons of the chief Rabbi Scevah, thought they could produce similar effects by using the name which Paul invoked, without any belief in Jesus. So they applied to a demoniac the formula, "I adjure thee by Jesus whom Paul preaches." But they were insulted and severely handled by the demoniac and obliged to fly from the house. On this many conjurors and magicians were converted, and burnt their magical books. This became a serious matter

[1] Acts xviii. 24—28. 1 Cor. i. 12. [2] Acts xix. 1—7.

for those who made their livelihood from the service of the gods, and Demetrius, who had a manufactory in which little silver images for the famous temple of Artemis were made, succeeded in exciting a popular uproar by the cry "Great is Artemis of the Ephesians," in the hope of destroying Paul and his companions, or at least expelling them from the city; but it was appeased by the skilful address of the town clerk.[1]

From Ephesus Paul wrote two important Epistles,—to the Galatians, and the first to the Corinthians. The communities he had founded in Galatia, chiefly of Gentile Christians but partly also of converted Jews, had been lately led astray by Judaizing teachers, so suddenly and so completely that it seemed to the Apostle like an enchantment.[2] These false guides recommended the Galatians to submit to circumcision, and to adopt several other usages of the Jewish law, and many followed their advice.

It has been thought strange that Paul makes no appeal in this Epistle to the decision of the Council at Jerusalem. But the Galatian Christians knew that decision well enough; Paul himself had brought it there. They knew that no one had any right to make their keeping the Law a condition of entering the Church or remaining in it, that to lay circumcision and the law on their necks as a compulsory yoke was forbidden. Nor do their false teachers appear to have meddled with this decision; they were not such zealots as those at Jerusalem, for they did not themselves keep the whole law or

[1] Acts xix. 35—41. [2] Gal. iii. 1.

require its observance from the Christians there, and they did not, like those at Jerusalem, threaten eternal damnation even to those who refused circumcision. Their chief ground was rather, according to Paul's own account, that they wished thereby to avert the persecutions of the Jews who were still powerful through the strength of their national and religious organisation, and to gain for the defenceless and unrecognised Christians the secure footing afforded by the Roman Law to Judaism.[1] For, as Jerome observes, all the circumcised, even if Christians, were treated as Jews by the Heathen, while the uncircumcised Christians were equally persecuted by Jew and Heathen.[2] These men accordingly recommended circumcision and observance of certain legal usages, partly for the sake of security, partly on religious grounds. They appealed to the example of the chief apostles in Judæa, who continued to observe the law themselves, and make others observe it, which they certainly would not have done, had they not believed they were thereby offering an acceptable service to God. As the Jews of that day generally said to the Heathen, "It is enough for salvation to abjure the worship of the gods and become a proselyte of the gate, but of course it is better and more pleasing to God to be circumcised and become a proselyte of righteousness and member of the chosen people,"—so could the Galatian Judaizers represent the usages of the law which they recommended to believers, as a higher stage, as something peculiarly meritorious and salutary. At the same time these Ju-

[1] Gal. vi. 12, 13. [2] Hieron. in Gal. ii. 10.

daizers made light of Paul's apostolic office; he had not received his mission through the ordinary call from Christ Himself, he had not lived in the company of Jesus on earth, but had gained his first knowledge of the gospel later from the real apostles; these last, Peter, James, and John, continued to observe the ritual law, and Paul, with his teaching got second-hand, could not have the same authority as the original great apostles.

To this Paul opposed himself with an energy and sharpness not to be found in any other Epistle. While unwillingly denouncing their fickleness, he protests that if an angel from heaven preached to them another doctrine he should be accursed; he shows by an account of his conversion and after life that he had received his gospel and his mission directly from Christ, and not from men, that he had become a master without having ever been a learner, but that his doctrine was constantly recognised by the most influential apostles as essentially one with their own. The remainder of this Epistle is occupied in pointing out that the Galatians were fools for wishing to exchange their gospel liberty for the bondage of the law, and he reminds them of their own experience, that they had received their spiritual gifts, not through observance of the law, but through faith.

About this time, whether before or after the Epistle to the Galatians is uncertain, Paul sent his first Epistle to the Corinthians. While the former is addressed to a small community in an out-of-the-way little town in the interior of Asia Minor, the Church of Corinth was one set on a candlestick, in one of the most important cities

111634

of the old world, a great commercial centre, and point of contact between East and West, where believers from other lands were constantly coming and going. The evils Paul had to combat here were also of a peculiar kind. The most conspicuous and mischievous of them was the encroachment of party spirit; some wanted to be Paulites, others followers of Apollos who had appeared as a teacher in Corinth; while others again, probably Jewish Christians, gave themselves out for disciples of Peter, either because he had really been in Corinth, or because foreign Jewish Christian teachers had come there, and gained adherents by using his name. And lastly, there were some from Palestine who in opposition to these three parties professed to wish to hold to Christ only, whom they had known personally.[1] There was no question here of doctrinal differences, or the apostle would have expressly named and combated them; but he treats these party watchwords merely as marking a defective sense of Church unity. Paul and Apollos were intimate friends, but the disciples of the latter prided themselves on the elevated form of teaching of one who was a master of Alexandrian philosophy and Scripture interpretation, and looked contemptuously on Paul's simple and unadorned preaching of the cross of Christ. Meanwhile, these attempts to form particular schools had not gone to the length of any open rupture of Church communion.

Paul therefore had to combat the excessive value of human wisdom and philosophical speculations, partly

[1] 1 Cor. i. 12.

with reference to the disciples of Apollos, partly to ward off errors sprung from Greek philosophy which threatened to become naturalised at Corinth. It was necessary to defend the doctrine of the resurrection against those Christians who denied the actual resurrection of the body, and explained the doctrine figuratively of the spiritual awakening of men through faith;[1] and, in a city where the prevalent fashion made temptations to sins of the flesh so powerful, a general warning was needed against this error also, and the evil consequences of a false liberty, for the Corinthian Christians were tolerating an incestuous man in their community. Lastly, they had to be reminded that it was unseemly for Christians to bring their litigations before the Heathen magistracy.

And here Paul examined with special care the question, how believers were to conduct themselves in the whole matter of partaking in sacrificial banquets and eating meats offered to idols. The Council of Jerusalem had forbidden this participation in general, but many difficulties arose in the application of the rule. Sacrificial banquets were often held in private houses as well as in the temples, and it was frequently impossible to know, in dining with a Heathen acquaintance, whether the meat put before you was of a sacrificed animal or not. It was hardly possible again to avoid buying such meat, for it was brought daily to the market. The Corinthians had asked about this, and the brief requirement of the Jerusalem Synod to abstain from things

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 12 sqq.

offered to idols, without any more precise definition, did not supply an answer. Strict Jewish Christians could extend it to cases which, from the nature of the thing, seemed to be left free to Gentile converts. Paul therefore did not appeal to it. He declared eating sacrificial meat, when bought in the market, or put before Christians at a Gentile banquet without any mention of what it was, to be indifferent in itself; but he desired Gentile Christians to refrain from using this liberty where there was danger of giving offence to their weaker brethren, the Jewish Christians, or leading them into sin. And he warned them against taking any formal part in a sacrificial banquet, for that always brought those who eat into communion with the demons to whom the Gentiles sacrificed.[1]

The news which Titus had brought the apostle about the reception and consequences of the first induced him to send a second Epistle to the Corinthians (after he had meanwhile been over Troas and Macedonia) which is a running personal apology of himself and his office, interspersed, however, with a great many admonitions. The intrusion of the Judaising false teachers compelled him to take this course; they represented him as a man who had ursurped the apostolate on his own authority, who was changeable and unreliable, at one time defiant, at another despondent, and not deserving the confidence of the Community in his vain self-exaltation.[2] Against this Paul urged that the national privileges on which

[1] 1 Cor. x. 14—32.

[2] 2 Cor. i. 17.; iii. 1. sqq.; x. 1. sqq.; xi. 11. sqq.

those "superlative apostles"[1] prided themselves belonged also to him, that he had done, striven, and suffered much more for God's cause than those dark and deceitful men, who falsely gave themselves out for apostles. He reminded them of the special proofs of divine power, visions and revelations, which had been given him in a state of ecstatic elevation; and he, therefore, required of the Corinthians a full recognition of his apostolic authority.[2] He also earnestly recommended a contribution for the poor Christians in Jerusalem.[3]

Paul had already extended his labours as far as Illyria, on the coast of the Adriatic sea, when he again went into Greece, and paid another visit of three months to Corinth and its neighbourhood. His Epistle to the Roman Christians was written at this time, and he is able to boast of having preached the Gospel and secured its acceptance all round from Jerusalem to Illyria.[4] The apostle had often felt a wish to visit the Christians in Rome, but had always abstained from doing so on his principle of not choosing a Church already founded by an apostle as the field of his energies, not, as he says, building on another man's foundation. But though he had not himself been at Rome, he had many friends and followers there, among them Aquila and Priscilla. And so he wrote, for the first time, to a community not personally known to him. The Church there must already have been in a flourishing state; their faith in

[1] τῶν ὑπὲρ λίαν ἀποστόλων.

[2] 2 Cor. xi. xii. 1—21.

[3] 2 Cor. viii. 1 sqq.

[4] Rom. xv. 19.

Christ was spoken of through the whole world,[1] as Paul says; though it consisted, of course, of a mixed body of Gentile and Jewish Christians, there were no parties and hostile principles at work, even if the difficulties of a complete fusion of Jewish and Gentile believers were felt there as elsewhere. The chief hindrances, however, were overcome when Paul sent this Epistle; he testifies to the Romans that they are full of goodness, filled with all knowledge, and able to admonish one another.[2] He warns them not against the actual but the possible danger of being misled by false doctrine. He had already spent more than twenty years in apostolic labours when he composed this document, the fullest and ripest fruit of his spirit, the chief record of his theology. He had already in his second Epistle to the Corinthians spoken of himself, in the full consciousness of his dignity and the triumphs he had won, as of a victorious general and mighty conqueror, before whose arms all errors fall like fortresses before a storming brigade, to whom all high things bow down, who takes captive all under the obedience of Christ.[3] He had in the main finished his work in the Eastern half of the Roman Empire, and he now turned his eyes to the West. He wanted to go to Spain and visit Rome on the way, but not till he had first brought the proceeds of a collection with his own hands to the Jewish capital, in order that the tie which connected the Western Church with the Mother Church of Jerusalem might not be loosened, and his true affection for his country-

[1] Rom. i. 8. [2] Rom. xv. 14. [3] 2 Cor. x. 3—5.

men and brethren of the circumcision might be known there.

Jews and Gentiles have no right to reproach one another; sin rules universally on both sides, over the Jews in consequence of their own law; all are wanting in righteousness before God, which cannot be gained through the works of the law in the broadest sense, but only through giving one's self up in faith to Christ, who as the second Adam gives far more to those who believe on Him than they have lost through the first Adam. But a great part of the Jewish people reject this salvation. They hold fast to the Law, as the way of salvation, in proud, self-willed obduracy and enmity against Christ. While some of them walk in the true path of salvation, the great mass of the nation seems as if it lay under a sentence of rejection from God, but at the last God will make good the promises given to His people. These are the leading ideas of this profound and outspoken Epistle, so rich in contrasts, in decisive and startling passages, and in out-pourings of sorrowful love towards the writer's blinded people.

And now, in spite of many warnings, Paul carried out his resolution of paying a fifth visit to Jerusalem, this time as the bearer of a contribution for the Church. From Philippi, where he met Luke, he went to Troas, and found there the three companions who were to accompany him, one of whom was Timotheus. At Miletus he bade a last farewell to the presbyters of the communities on the coasts of Asia, commended to their care the churches entrusted to them, and prophesied to them the

near approach of false teachers, who would arise from among themselves. He knew well that, as he here said, bonds and affliction awaited him; Agabus, too, told him this in Cæsarea.[1] At Pentecost (of 58 or 59 A.D.) he came, probably after five years absence, to Jerusalem. He gave an account of the results of his apostolical labours to the Bishop James and the assembled presbyters. On this James advised him, as there were many thousand converted Israelites who were all zealous adherents of the law, to do an act which would dispel the suspicion that he was a despiser of the ordinances of his nation and taught his countrymen to neglect them; namely, to associate himself in a Nazarite vow with four poor members of the Christian community by paying the costs of the offering. Finding himself here in the very central seat of the Law, where all, Jews and Christians alike, observed it, and where it controlled all public arrangements, as no sign had yet been given from God for breaking up the old edifice, Paul had no scruple in following this advice and appearing in the temple to make an offering. Not long before Agrippa, on coming from Rome to take possession of the throne, had adopted the same means to gain the favour of the Jews;[2] and Paul himself had laid it down as his principle to become a Jew to the Jews in order to win them, and had already performed a vow in Jerusalem.[3]

Scarcely had Paul set foot in the temple when the Jews of Asia Minor, who knew him, raised an outcry against the man who everywhere taught against the

[1] Acts xx. 17—38; xxi. 11.
[2] Joseph. Arch. xvii. 6, 1.
[3] 1 Cor. vii. 17—19.

people, the law, and the temple, which he had now come to desecrate. For he had been seen with the Greek Trophimus, one of his companions, and was supposed to have brought him into the temple. The Roman temple guard snatched him from the hands of the raving multitude, and Paul tried to change their feelings by a speech delivered from the steps of the Castle of Antonia and a narration of his past life. They listened quietly till he mentioned the mission to the Gentiles imparted to him in the temple. Then the storm broke out; a Jew could bear any thing rather than the notion that the uncircumcised Gentiles should be made equal with the sons of Abraham. They cried out that such a wretch must be made away with from the earth. Paul appealed to his rights as a Roman citizen, against the design of the Roman commander to extort a confession by torture. When brought before the Sanhedrim, he skilfully threw a firebrand into the mixed assembly of Pharisees and Sadducees, by putting forward his Pharisaic descent and education and his belief in the resurrection as the cause of his persecution by the Sadducees, to whom the High priest himself inclined. He could truly say that his whole teaching was based on the resurrection of Christ and the future resurrection of all believers, especially as the first persecution of Christians proceeded from the Sadducee party who predominated in the Synagogue. An angry contention between the two parties was the consequence, and some Pharisees took the apostle's side as an innocent and orthodox man, granting even the truth of the alleged vision. Set free for this time

he was sent by the commander Lysias, who wished to save him from a murderous plot of forty Jews against his life, to Cæsarea to the procurator Felix, under a strong guard. There, after a few days, the high priest Ananias made his appearance, with other members of the Sanhedrim as accusers, but neither Felix nor his successor Festus were willing to condemn him or give him up to the Jews. So Paul remained two years at Cæsarea in prison, not choosing to ransom himself with money. He vainly sought to touch or to shake King Agrippa, Festus' guest. But as he had appealed to Cæsar he was to be sent, still as a prisoner, to Rome.

In the spring of 61 Paul landed on the coast of Italy. The Roman Christians went to meet him as far as Tres Tabernæ, and then was fulfilled the apostle's long cherished desire to work in the capital of the world, and the promise given him in a night vision at Jerusalem, that he should bear witness of the Lord also in Rome. He was allowed to live in a private house with a soldier chained to him, and so spent two years in Rome, closely guarded, but free to receive visits and preach Christ.[1] Early in the first year, he sent for the principal men among the Jews there, thinking that hostile reports had probably reached them from Jerusalem. They assured him that they had heard nothing about him, but knew the Nazarene sect was everywhere spoken against. Here, too, his teaching had its usual result of leading them to mock him, and he hurled one word at them bitterer than death; "This salvation of God is sent to the Gentiles, and they will hear it."

[1] Acts xxviii. 30.

What caused the apostle's long detention was the delay of his accusers, who did not reach Rome till later, or perhaps allowed their charges to drop through non-appearance. If they really appeared, they would have to support their three charges against him—of exciting disturbance and party spirit among the Jews of the whole Empire, of being a ringleader of the Nazarenes, and of seeking to profane the temple—by numerous witnesses collected from various provinces. And as the Emperor Nero was in the habit of trying persons accused of several offences only at intervals, and taking each charge separately, that, too, would protract the process for a long time. But that it would end in acquittal might be seen from the conduct of Felix and Festus. Meanwhile Paul maintained through his messengers a constant intercourse with the churches he had founded all over the Empire, and even with those he had not himself founded or visited in person. Many of his oldest and most faithful adherents surrounded him in Rome. Luke, Timotheus, Tychicus, Demas, who afterwards left him, and Mark, who had caused the former separation between him and Barnabas, were there and ministered to him. Two Macedonians, Aristarchus and Epaphras of Colossæ, were his fellow prisoners.[1]

He wrote three Epistles at this time—the short one to Philemon in behalf of his faithless and runaway slave, that to the Colossians, and that to the Ephesians. The Church at Colossæ in Phrygia had not been founded by Paul, nor as yet visited by him. But he had learnt

[1] Col. i. 1, 7; iv. 7, 10, 14. Philip. i. 1. Eph. vi. 21. Philem. 23, 24.

from its founder, Epaphras, who was now in Rome, that the faith of Christians there was in danger from false teachers, forerunners of the great Gnostic movement of the second century, who joined to Gnostic principles a zeal for the Jewish law, especially its new moons and festivals. They taught abstinence from flesh and wine, cautioned men against defilement from touching or tasting unclean things, and boasting of a higher traditionary wisdom maintained with a show of humility, that God was incomprehensible and out of reach, and must therefore be worshipped through intermediate beings, angels or higher spirits.[1]

Tychicus, who was the bearer of this Epistle, had also another short document composed by the apostle afterwards to deliver. It is inscribed to the Ephesians, but as the writer says nothing of his earlier labours for more than a year in Ephesus, and there are no personal allusions to members of that community, nor is even the name of Ephesus found in the older MSS., it clearly had a more general scope, and was a circular addressed to the Churches on the Asiatic coast, in whose assemblies it was to be read, though Paul had Ephesus chiefly in his eye.[2] The close similarity in the turn of thought shows this Epistle to have been written at the same time with that to the Colossians. It contains first a short abstract of Pauline doctrine, chiefly in the indirect form of a thanksgiving, special prominence being assigned to the abolition of the Mosaic law, which im-

[1] Col. ii. 16—22.

[2] Tertull. c. Marc. v. 11. Basil c. Eunom. i 254.

plied the removal of separation between Jew and Gentile. The writer speaks of the fulness of grace given to them and the antithesis of their former Gentile life to their present one, of the unity of the Church where Gentiles are united with believing Israel in one temple of God, and of the exalted office God had conferred specially on him of calling the Gentile world into the Church. The second part includes a number of moral instructions and exhortations.

The Philippian Church, the first Paul had founded in Europe, had sent him a contribution by Epaphroditus, to support him in his imprisonment. Their messenger brought so favourable a report of their state, that in his letter of thanks he could praise them more highly than any other community. The whole Epistle accordingly is written in a tone of joyful exultation, and is pre-eminently an outpouring of warm and hearty affection for them. Here there were no internal divisions, but he thought it needful to warn them against his Jewish opponents and the false teachers who penetrated everywhere, and to show that he shared all the privileges boasted of by the false brethren of the circumcision who depreciated him.

It is the tradition of the whole ancient Church that Paul was released from prison, and, after working as an apostle for two or three years more, was put to death in the Neronian persecution in the year 67. In recent times this release and second imprisonment have been sharply contested, and it has been assumed that the first imprisonment only ended with his death. But there is

conclusive evidence of the truth of the old tradition. When the "Acts," written by Paul's attendant, after the fullest and most detailed account of his journey and arrival at Rome suddenly close with the statement that he remained two whole years at Rome under a military guard, this implies that with the two years his imprisonment ended. And it must have ended, either by his death or his release; clearly not by his death, for it would be inconceivable that Luke, who devotes the whole second part of his book to the biography of Paul, should not have added the coping-stone so gloriously crowning his hero's work. On the other hand, his silence as to what followed the two years' imprisonment is perfectly natural, for he was no longer the apostle's companion, and he wrote his narrative before the year 67, and therefore could not mention his death. The apostle's release at that time is quite probable in itself, for the Jews, as Felix and Festus had already perceived, were obviously in no position to convict him of any capital crime according to Roman law: nor is it probable that a Roman citizen would be kept, not two, but four years in prison without any trial.

There is not a single witness in Christian antiquity to contradict the positive testimony of Clement, the Muratorian Canon, Eusebius, Chrysostom, and Jerome.[1] Clement, the contemporary and disciple of Paul, says in his letter from Rome to Corinth, that Paul had preached the Gospel in East and West, and taught the whole world (*i. e.* the whole Roman world) righteousness, had

[1] Euseb. ii. 22. Chrys. in 2 Tim. iv. 20. Hieron. *Catal. Script.*

gone to the extreme boundaries of the West, borne testimony before rulers, or suffered martyrdom, and thus been taken out of the world.[1] Here is a distinct geographical statement, and a writer in Rome cannot have understood Rome by the limits of the West. Clement had already mentioned generally Paul's having preached in the West, but he wishes to add something more to bring out more conspicuously the all-embracing heroic energy of the apostle, namely that he had gone to the extremest limits of the West,[2] certainly meaning one of the western provinces of the Empire. The author of the Muratorian Canon, dating between 165 and 175, expressly asserts that this was Spain.[3] To this is added

[1] Clem. Rom. i. 5.

[2] Wieseler's notion of translating τὸ τέρμα τῆς δύσεως the Rulers of Rome would hardly deserve a refutation if Schaff (Geschichte der apost. Kirche, p. 348) had not adopted it, and translated "he appeared before the highest authority of the West;" but it is pure assumption that τέρμα anywhere means this. In the passsage quoted κακῶν δ' ἀναψυχὰς θεοὶ βροτοῖσι νέμουσιν, ἁπάντων τέρμ' ἔχοντες αὐτοί. (Eur. Suppl. 617.) τέρμα means the goal or end (of sufferings), not highest power, as Schaff imagines. So in τέρμα σωτηρίας, Soph. Œd. Col. 725, Eur. Orest. 1337, (*metam salutis.*) No weight can be attached to the circumstance that there is no tradition in Spain of any Church founded there by Paul. We know almost nothing of the history of the Spanish Church for the first three centuries; two martyrs of a later date, the deposition of two Bishops in the third century mentioned in Cyprian's letters, and the Canons of the Synod of Elvira—that is all. The tradition of the Spanish Church reaches no further back than the third century; no Spanish Christians wrote anything before the end of the fourth.

[3] Sicuti et (Lucas) semota passione Petri evidenter declarat seu (*or* et) profectione Pauli ab urbe ad Spaniam proficiscentis. Cf. Wieseler *in den theol. Studien*, 1856, p. 105. The author here infers from the omission of these two occurrences, Peter's death and Paul's Spanish journey, that Luke only records what took place in his own presence. He thus puts both facts in the same category of certainty.

the weighty testimony of the Pastoral Epistles which can only be got rid of by the purely novel assumption of their being spurious; for they cannot be placed either before or during the first imprisonment without doing violence to the statements of fact contained in them, and they prove that Paul after that imprisonment visited Ephesus, Crete, Macedonia, and Nicopolis, and was then a second time imprisoned at Rome.[1]

The three Pastoral Epistles of Paul were written within a few months of each other; they correspond in style, in matter, and in their account of the condition of the Church, and are essentially different in these points from the rest of his Epistles. All attempts to separate them in date have failed and must fail. A longer period of some five or six years must have elapsed between his Epistle to the Philippians, the last during his first imprisonment, and the first to Timotheus, and it is most likely that this and the Epistle to Titus were written shortly before his last arrival in Rome. He had found Jewish proselytes in Spain to whom he could preach the Gospel in all the towns on the coast from Tarraco to Cadis. From Spain he seems to have gone to Ephesus about the year 66, where he found heretical teachers busy at work, the forerunners and first founders of Gnosticism. He did not, however, stay there long but hastened to other regions. The foreboding that he had but a short time to work, joined with the sense of bodily weakness and old age—several years earlier in his Epistle to the Philippians he had called himself an old

[1] 2 Tim. i. 16, 17.

man—drove him restlessly from place to place, to found as many new communities as possible, or visit and confirm for the last time those already founded. Thus he came first to Macedonia then to Crete. From Macedonia he sent his first Epistle to his beloved disciple Timotheus, of whom he had before said that he did the Lord's work like himself.[1] This Epistle was to advise him as to the active administration of his episcopal office at Ephesus, and especially the appointment of Church ministers, and to put him in a condition to oppose the Judaizing Gnostic teachers at Ephesus with the apostle's authority, and with greater success.

Soon afterwards Paul went by Ephesus to Crete, where, as many expressions in his Epistle to Titus indicate, he found Christian communities already founded, which had likewise been disturbed by false teachers, and had very little fixed organization. On his departure he left behind his companion and disciple Titus, as his representative with full powers for ordering the community, and soon after, just before setting out for the West, sent him, probably from Ephesus, the Epistle in which he instructed him about the discharge of his office and his conduct towards the Judaizing false teachers. At Nicopolis in Epirus, where he meant to spend the winter, Titus was again to join him. On the way there he left his old companion Trophimus sick at Miletus, and Erastus at Corinth. It was probably during the winter at Nicopolis that he was seized and sent to stand his trial at Rome, as so conspicuous a Christian

[1] 1 Tim. i. 3. Tit. i. 5. 1 Cor. xvi. 10.

teacher could not long remain hidden in the then state of things. Fear of danger now scattered his companions and disciples. Demas, who had attended him faithfully in his first imprisonment, left him "from love for the world," and went to Thessalonica, Crescens turned to Galatia, Titus may have gone by his wish to Dalmatia. Only Luke held out and accompanied him to Rome.[1]

This second imprisonment of the apostle at Rome was very different from the first, from which he was released at the beginning of the year 63. Then he was left free to preach the Gospel in his hired dwelling to a numerous audience: every one could easily find the house where he lived for two years, and had free entry. Then the widely-spread tidings of his freedom in preaching, notwithstanding his bonds, had filled the great body of Roman Christians with courage, so that they, too, preached Christ fearlessly. But now Onesiphorus, on coming to Rome, had much trouble to search him out; all his companions and assistants but one had deserted him. It was far too dangerous to show any interest in him, and every Christian had to fear for his own life.[2] He was not only chained now, but, unlike the former occasion, treated as a criminal. For, since then, the Christians had been accused of the burning of Rome, and horrible executions had taken place. The trial of Paul came two years later, but the abhorrence of the new sect was nowise softened, and he was notorious as a leader of it. It laid a man open to so much suspicion,

[1] 2 Tim. iv. 11.

[2] Phil. i. 13, 14. 2 Tim. i. 17; iv. 16.

to give him even the ordinary legal assistance, that at his first hearing he had to dispense with the aid of counsel; this hearing was probably before the city prefect,[1] for the Emperor was in Greece. When Paul says he was at this time delivered from the lion's mouth,[2] he refers to his acquittal on the charge of participation in the burning of Rome, and escape from the horrible death which condemnation on that score would have implied. He knew well that he had not been acquitted absolutely, and had not escaped death. He wrote after this first hearing to Timotheus, that his blood would soon be poured out as a drink-offering and the time of his departure was at hand. The faithful Luke was with him, and he had found new disciples, Linus, Pudens, and Claudia, but he longed to see his beloved Timotheus once more, and to give him his last charges; therefore he wrote this second Epistle, to beg him to come quickly. But as he was very uncertain whether Timotheus would find him alive, he gave him many admonitions about the discharge of his office in the Church, exhorted him to steadfastness in persecution, and warned him again of the new false doctrine.

The Epistle to the Hebrews, *i.e.* the Jewish Christians of Palestine, coincides in date with the latter years of the apostle's life. It is clear from internal evidence that it was not written before the year 63 or after 69. It is addressed to men familiar with the Levitical service and rites of the temple, and living in its neighbour-

[1] Clement of Rome says ἐπὶ τῶν λεγομένων, which clearly cannot mean the Emperor.

[2] 2 Tim. iv. 17.

hood, so that the Jewish worship and priesthood still exercise their full influence over them. Their Church had existed a long time; their original ministers and teachers were already dead; and their death could be held up as a pattern to survivors, from the unshaken constancy with which they died for their belief.[1] A second generation of Christians had grown up, but they were in imminent peril of falling away from Christ and returning to Judaism. Some had already forsaken public worship. There is no reference in any other apostolical Epistle to the danger here mentioned of apostasy to Judaism and blasphemy against Christ. This state of things had now appeared for the first time in Judæa, and especially at Jerusalem, caused apparently by the hostility of the unconverted Jews, and the fear of exclusion from the temple worship. But it is a mistake to affirm, as has often been done of late, that the author of the Epistle required an entire separation from the Jewish religion.[2] He would not have done that incidentally in a couple of passing words, but have explained his grounds at length. As long as the temple stood, no Jewish Christian was required to abjure the Levitical worship. But the writer points out the superiority of the New to the Old Covenant, with its purely transitory and symbolical character, the dignity of Messiah and the prerogatives of the New as compared with the Old Testament revelation, and that the offering of

[1] Heb. v. 12; xiii. 7.

[2] As *e.g.* in Lünemann's and Delitzch's erroneous interpretation of Heb. xiii. 13.

Christ precludes all need of further offering for sin. The form of an Epistle only comes out towards the end of this document; the earlier portion is more like a treatise, carefully tracing out the chain of argument, and elaborating the subject with a more systematic arrangement than is found in any other apostolical Epistle, not without some display of oratory. It was written originally, not in Aramaic, but in Greek; it bears no apostle's name, and cannot in its present form be the work of Paul's hand, though breathing his spirit. We cannot, indeed, urge, as has often been done, the passage speaking of the salvation first proclaimed by the Lord being handed down to us by those that heard it, as conclusive against his authorship.[1] For that is said in the name of the community addressed, and it would have been very far-fetched and gratuitous for the apostle, who in fact had not heard the preaching of Jesus directly, to insert a saving clause; "I have indeed received an inward revelation from the Lord." But there are other proofs that he did not write the Epistle;—the author invariably follows the Alexandrian version, even where differing completely in sense from the Hebrew,[2] whereas Paul does not keep strictly to it but much oftener translates for himself;—secondly, Paul always names himself at the beginning of his Epistles; and lastly, the style is more polished, and flows more evenly and smoothly, but is less precise than

[1] Heb. ii. 3.

[2] See Heb. x. 5 especially.

Paul's where the thought seems often to be struggling with the language, and the tone is less dialectical and more rhetorical, betraying a philosophical education.

Nevertheless, the tradition of the Eastern Church, followed afterwards by the Western, has recognised the apostle Paul as the principal author of the Epistle. It was attributed to him by the Syrian and Alexandrian Churches, those nearest the community it is addressed to, but the general belief was, that he had not written it with his own hand, but used the services of another, either Luke or Clement. Clement of Alexandria's idea, that Luke translated the apostle's Hebrew into Greek, is quite untenable, for the Epistle betrays clearly enough its original Greek composition, and Paul's friend or disciple must have contributed more to the authorship than mere translation. Clement of Rome cannot be regarded as the writer, or joint writer, for then it would be the more unintelligible how the Epistle came to be so long rejected or ignored in the Roman Church, and the difference between this Epistle and his to the Corinthians is too great for both to be by the same author, besides that the use made in the latter of this one is further evidence against it. Tertullian's assertion, that Barnabas is the writer, stands quite alone. Nor is there any trace or hint in the Ancient Church of the conjecture that Apollos wrote it, and as nothing more distinct is known of Apollos it is a mere makeshift. It continues, therefore, to be the most probable

view, that Luke wrote the Epistle under Paul's inspiration, and to this the most ancient tradition points.[1]

Of all the personages in the New Testament Paul is the one we know best; his form is brought visibly before us, not only in the narrative of his disciple and companion Luke, but in his own Epistles. His personal appearance seems not to have been striking; the Lycaonians took him for Hermes, and Barnabas for Zeus, clearly because the personal appearance of the latter was the more stately, that of Paul insignificant.[2] His letters, said his Corinthian opponents, are weighty and strong; but his bodily presence is feeble, and his speech is contemptible;[3] they thought such bodily defects and weaknesses as were peculiar to him irreconcilable with the apostolical authority he laid claim to. He himself felt most keenly the incongruity of his outward appearance and bodily powers with the high vocation entrusted to him. His want of eloquence even made him shy and embarrassed:—"I was with you in weakness, and in much fear and trembling," he writes to the Corinthians.[4] He compares his bodily state with its signs of infirmity, paleness and the like, to the condition of the Lord on the cross.[5] He speaks of a troublesome, depressing, unintermittent pain, whose recurring paroxysms he found a "sting in the flesh," as though he were struck by a demon with his fists.[6] Three

[1] Clem. Alex. *ap. Eus.* vi. 14. Tertull. *de Pudic.* 20. Origen *ap. Eus.* vi. 25. Hieron. *Cat.* 5.

[2] Acts xiv. 11.

[3] 2 Cor. x. 10.

[4] 1 Cor. ii. 3.

[5] 2 Cor. iv. 10.

[6] 2 Cor. xii. 7.

times he had prayed that it might be taken away, but his prayer was not granted. To this were added the wounds and scars, which he received in his apostolical office, but which he bore as honourable tokens, as marks of his Lord imprinted on him the servant of Christ.[1]

But in this feeble frame there dwelt a mighty spirit, a glowing enthusiasm that never slackened, a courage that never failed. And if all he accomplished was wrought in constant struggle with his frail and sickly body, if he had the consciousness of carrying the lofty treasure committed to him in an earthen vessel, this did not prevent him from glorying in his weakness, and finding in it a ground of joyful exultation, because when weak in himself then he was strong in God.[2] And if the depth and richness of his thoughts strove in vain for adequate expression, if his thoughts seemed to carry him away, yet he spoke "with power, and in the name of the Holy Ghost, and in great confidence."[3] For he had the profoundest conviction of possessing the Spirit of God,[4] that Christ spoke through him, or he in Christ,[5] and that the Lord dwelt in him with His power.[6] And in fact Christ left him in no want of signs and proofs of His altogether exceptional guidance and enlightenment. Four times, so far as we know, in his apostolical course the consolation of a special vision and encouragement was vouchsafed him by the Lord.

[1] Gal. vi. 17.
[2] 2 Cor. iv. 7; xii. 10.
[3] 1 Thess. i. 5.
[4] 1 Cor. vii. 40.
[5] 2 Cor. ii. 17; xiii. 3.
[6] 2 Cor. xii. 9.

This took place, first in the temple at Jerusalem, soon after his conversion; again in Corinth, immediately after his being cast out of the Synagogue, when Jesus gave him in the night the same assurance He had given to the other apostles,—"I am with thee;" then a third time, in the castle of Antonia; and lastly, during the shipwreck.[1] Once it befel him in an ecstasy to feel himself suddenly transported into the seat of the glory of Christ, into the immediate presence of God, where he heard wonderful words that could not be repeated.[2] And above all, He whom he saw on the way to Damascus was constantly with him; he called on Him, and was answered, and found in this personal converse and uninterrupted revelation the richest compensation and comfort for all the "infirmities, reproaches, necessities, persecutions, and distresses," to which he was a prey.[3] He needed, indeed, that continual strengthening and support, for what he had to bear in the execution of his apostolical office was beyond the powers of a man infirm in body, and the victim of severe suffering. When he wrote his Second Epistle to the Corinthians (A.D. 57), about ten years before his death, he had already been scourged five times by the Jews, and this punishment of the thirty-nine stripes, ordered by the law, was so horrible that the victims sometimes died of it.[4] Notwithstanding his rights of citizenship he had thrice endured the Roman punishment of whipping with rods, which also not unfrequently caused death. Once at

[1] Acts xviii. 10; xxiii. 11; xxvii. 23.
[2] 2 Cor. xii. 1—4.
[3] 2 Cor. xii. 10.
[4] Joseph. Arch. viii. 21, 23.

Lystra the mob, incited by the Jews, had stoned him, so that he was taken for dead.[1] Thrice he had suffered shipwreck, and had once in consequence been driven about a day and a night on the sea with help of a wreck often covered by the waves. He had been seven times imprisoned before his death.[2]

The doctrine which Paul taught became flesh and blood in his person; it was bound up with his whole being, with his most personal and individual feelings and experiences. He was not only a disciple and imitator of Christ, but was completely possessed and inspired by Him. Since that one appearance of Christ, when He revealed Himself in His glory and divine majesty, Paul had become quite another man, his very consciousness and life were different; he was now so inwardly united with Christ that the thought of Him and the consciousness of His presence was mixed up with every act and consideration, and his habitual condition was one of continual exaltation and, as compared with other men, of ecstasy.[3] He speaks of himself as so completely ruled by the love Christ attested in His atoning death, that he is no more his own master, that he must follow the constraint of that love without regard to any personal considerations. He feels as one dead with Christ, to whom the world is crucified and he to the world.[4] His endeavour was to make his own life in actions and sufferings a worthy transcript of the life of Jesus. In his own sufferings he saw only a continuation and filling

[1] Acts xiv. 19. [2] Clem. Rom. Ep. i. 1, 5.
[3] Gal. ii, 20; vi. 14. 2 Cor. v. 16, Phil. iii. 20, [4] Gal. vi. 14.

up of the sufferings of Christ.[1] Whether he shall glorify Christ by his life or death is the same to him;[2] he would prefer to die and be with Christ, if it were not his office to serve the Church.

The purely human many-sidedness[3] and spiritual mobility of Greek character was first transfigured in Paul into an entire self-surrender to the service of known truth, and raised to a saintly purity. To preach the Gospel is to him not a matter of free choice but a sacred duty and necessity. He only knows that he is a passive instrument in God's hand, that he has no power in himself to restrain those mighty deeds and doctrines in their victorious course through the world. He cannot comprehend the notion of the office of preaching entrusted to him remaining unfulfilled.[4] He feels, indeed, free from all earthly bonds, yet bound more than any man, for he is the servant of all, under an obligation to minister to all men with his gospel.[5] And this ministry was moulded by his sincere geniality of character into a real art. He possessed a marvellous capability and readiness for putting himself in the place of others, for adapting his words and actions to the condition and comprehension of every body. With affectionate sympathy he completely merged himself in his converts, and took their feelings upon him; their joys and their sufferings were his, so thoroughly that in one of his Epistles two Pauls seem to speak interchangeably, the one absolutely identified with the feelings, views, and circum-

[1] Col. i. 24. [2] Phil. i. 21. [3] [The εὐτραπελία of Thucydides.—Tr.]
[4] 1 Cor. ix. 16. [5] 1 Cor. ix. 19.

stances of his fellow believers, the other standing over them to instruct, to correct, and to punish in his apostolic dignity. And thus he is able to say that he became all things to all men, to the Jews as a Jew, to the Gentiles as without law, that he might win them. He became for the whole Church the special model of that pastoral love which accommodates itself to all, yielding in indifferent matters, and gradually raising the weaker to itself. He first taught, by word and example, how genuine love should deny itself the use of a lawful freedom. "If eating offend my brother, I had rather eat no flesh all my life." [1]

He is accordingly present to the Church he is guiding, in all his instructions and ordinances, with the whole force of his mind and energy of his will; where his letters go he goes with them, absent in body, as he says, but present in spirit. He always seems to reckon beforehand the effect of his words With his mental eye sharpened by love, and by rich experience and intuitive knowledge of human nature, he divines the feelings and dispositions of the new Christians, and meets them with the right word. He is ever with them; he thinks, feels, lives, and suffers with them. Time and distance have no power over this fellowship of belief, joys, and sorrows. It is very seldom that he gives direct and simple commands, he rules his communities by drawing them into fellowship with his own judgment and will. While he takes on himself their views and trials, he merely lays before them in return his judgment and feelings. In-

[1] 1 Cor. viii. 13.

stead of prescribing rigid laws he strives to assimilate them to himself, and to fuse his spirit into perfect unity with theirs.

It has often been thought strange that Paul's Epistles contain so extremely few references to the history of Jesus; but he wrote to those who were already believers, to whom, as he expressed it, he had discharged the office of mother and nurse.[1] Moreover, it is always the crucified and risen Lord who is before his mind; this double form he carries in himself, and speaks of one or the other to his converts. His gospel is a gospel of the glory of Christ, and a doctrine of the Cross; he rather looks forward to the future, and the approaching reappearance of Jesus in His glory, than backwards to the time of His earthly pilgrimage.[2] There are seldom, again, express quotations of the sayings of Jesus to be found in Paul's writings, and not in important questions. He is not wont to appeal to the words of the Lord, but to the fulness of his own apostolic power, to the crucifixion and resurrection of the Lord. Yet he repeats the words used at the institution of the Eucharist, and mentions a saying of Jesus not found in the Gospels. He only twice appeals to precepts of Jesus, once in reference to the right of apostles and missionaries to live of the Gospel, once in distinguishing between his own opinion and Christ's command, when he quotes the prohibition of divorce.[3] But it is clear enough that he had the Lord's declarations before his mind, in his moral exhor-

[1] 1 Thess. ii. 7. [2] Rom vi. 9—11; vii. 4; x. 9. 2 Cor. iv. 4; xi. 30
[3] 1 Cor. vii. 10; ix. 14.

tations and his references to the things after death. The apostle's humility and ready admission that he, the persecutor of Christ and His disciples, was a great sinner did not withhold him from boasting and testifying what great things God had wrought in him and through him, and referring to the signs and wonders he had worked as proofs of his real and legitimate apostleship. That he considered due to his office, far as he was from all self-exaltation. Thus he reminds the Corinthians that he had vindicated his apostolate among them by miracles and signs of divine power, and in patient endurance of adversity;[1] and he goes further in his Epistle to the Romans, where he boasts of having spread the Gospel of Christ from Jerusalem to Illyricum, through the power of his miracles wrought by the help of God.[2]

Two expressions in the Epistle to the Galatians have been often alleged as implying a split, a great division and a stiffness between Paul and the elder apostles, which in reality had no existence. Far from desiring to depreciate the authority and successful work of the other apostles as compared with his own, Paul always speaks of them with full acknowledgment and respect, allying himself and making common cause with them. He feels and says that he and they are equal to each other, equal in the dignity of their office and mission, and in the reverence of mankind. "God hath set forth us the apostles last, as it were condemned to death, a spectacle to the world, to angels, and to men."[3] He places the

[1] 2 Cor. xii. 12. [2] Rom. xv. 19. [3] 1 Cor. iv. 9.

apostles first in the Church ;[1] they are with the Prophets its foundations.[2] They are his brethren, and men whose labours do honour to Christ.[3] He names himself as the least of the apostles, although he or rather the grace of God in him has laboured more than they all.[4] Paul was not converted by an apostle but by the immediate revelation and call of Christ; he received not from his colleagues but from Christ Himself his apostolic office and mission. What he called his Gospel, that is the equality of the Gentiles in the Church through faith without observing the Mosaic Law with the Jewish converts who kept it, and their equal possession of hope and means of grace—that was immediately made known to him through a special communication. In this certainty of his call and his doctrine, in the consciousness that God is with him giving testimony by His miraculous power, he uses the authoritative language of a mighty ruler in the spiritual Kingdom; he feels strong and well armed enough to pull down every fortress that exalts itself against the knowledge of God, to bend down every thought and imagination of men under the obedience of Christ, and to punish all disobedience.[5]

The other apostles on their side must have been fully conscious of their high privilege as compared with Paul. Jesus Himself had pronounced them blessed in seeing what they saw ;[6] He had spoken of their seeing the day

[1] Eph. iv. 11.
[2] Eph. ii. 20.
[3] 2 Cor. viii. 23.
[4] 1 Cor. xv. 9.
[5] 2 Cor. x. 4—6.
[6] Luke x. 23 seq.

of the Son of Man as a great blessing, and had foretold that afterwards in their afflictions they would look back with earnest desire to one of those days.[1] How does John in his old age exult in the joy of the consciousness that he has seen with his eyes and handled with his hands Him who was from the beginning![2] But this consciousness led to no division on either side. If Peter and Paul agreed on a certain division of labour, this was grounded on the feeling of Peter and the rest of the elder apostles that their whole education fitted and called them pre-eminently to work among the Jews, that it was their office to bring in the Gentiles where a foundation had been previously laid of converted Jews and well-instructed communities of Jewish Christians. Peter and the other elder apostles required for working on the Gentiles the intervention of the converted Jews of the dispersion, who were already familiar with Heathen views and morals, while Paul was the right man to act immediately on the Gentiles with the best success. But if Paul designated himself the apostle of the Gentiles, he did not mean that he was to give preference to the Gentiles over the Jews in carrying out his vocation; on the contrary, his first duty and endeavours always belonged to the Jews. But he meant that the wide domain of the Heathen provinces of the Empire, (where the Jews were only scattered here and there), was the special field of his apostolical energy, while the other apostles were still devoting themselves to the communities in Judæa and Galilee, which contained only Jewish Christians or

[1] Luke xvii. 22. [2] 1 John i. 1—4.

so few Gentiles that the Jewish element gave their dominant character to these societies, and the few Gentile converts had to adapt themselves to it. On the contrary, in the communities founded or visited by Paul, the Gentile converts predominated from the beginning, and the Jewish Christians who chanced to be there were necessarily required to act accordingly, and to renounce the separatist element of the law which forbade to eat with the uncircumcised.

Peter directed his first Epistle, at a date which cannot be precisely fixed, to the communities in the north of Asia Minor, consisting partly of Jews, but chiefly of Gentile converts, to the believers living as strangers scattered among the Heathen in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia,—communities partly founded by Paul. Silas, an earlier companion of Paul, was its bearer.[1] The word, "dispersion," in the title does not at all mean that the Epistle was only addressed to the Christians of Jewish descent in those communities—a division Peter never dreamt of—but it suggested itself as the natural designation for Christians who, like the Jews before, were a "dispersion," and felt themselves a scattered body of strangers in the Roman Empire, yet inwardly united by the closest bonds.[2] There are several expressions in the Epistle which can only be understood of those who had for-

[1] 1 Peter v. 12.

[2] Cf. 1 Pet. ii. 11, where the Christians are called emphatically παροίκοι καὶ παρεπιδήμοι, as in the superscription παρεπιδήμοις διασπορᾶς.

merly been Heathen.[1] Their past and future sufferings and persecutions gave occasion to the apostle to strengthen the believers, by pointing to the promises they had received of future glory. Christian hope, and its proper influence over the whole life, is the ruling idea of his Epistle, which is hortatory, not dogmatic. He shows them how highly they have been favoured, as being redeemed and regenerate, and that it is their duty in consequence of that great gift to put to shame the reproaches of the Heathen by purity of life; to aim not only at individual sanctity, but at the glory and perfection of the whole Church, as the people now more than ever chosen by God for His own. A number of admonitions are added bearing on particular details of daily life. It is obvious that Paul's Epistles to the Ephesians and Romans had left fixed impressions on the mind of Peter which are reflected in his writings. At the same time this Epistle is interwoven with Old Testament words and phrases, in which it was natural to him to clothe his thoughts. Its whole line, both in what it says and what it does not say, proves that the original difficulties in the way of a complete coalescing of Jewish and Gentile Christians were already overcome, at least in those regions, and that the errors Paul had to combat in writing to the Galatians no longer presented themselves, while the seduction of Jewish Gnosticism had not yet appeared. The date of the composition must therefore be placed several years before the apostle's death, before, indeed, Paul had written his Epistles to the Colossians, to Timothy, and Titus.

[1] 1 Peter iv. 3, 4.

On the other hand, the apostle's second Epistle, addressed later to the same communities, is a kind of testament; he knows that his departure is at hand, and warns the Churches of the danger of erroneous doctrine, of Antinomian heretics who are spoken of partly as future, partly as already come, as men who on the ground of their *gnosis* and false spiritualism preached an indulgence of all the lusts of the flesh, and denied the Second Coming of Christ and the judgment. The remarkable agreement of this Epistle with that of Jude is not to be explained by Peter using Jude's, but on the contrary by Jude having Peter's before him, and recognizing in the erroneous teachers who had meantime actually appeared those whom Peter had foretold. Clearly as the Epistle reveals the hand of the Prince of the apostles, it very slowly attained universal acknowledgment and use in the ancient Church. It is not found in the older Syrian *Peschito*, Origen and Eusebius reckon it among disputed writings; yet Hermas had already used it, Clement of Alexandria had commented on it in his Hypotypes, Firmilian of Cæsarea had appealed to it, and from thenceforward, especially since the fourth century, it was universally accepted as canonical. According to Jerome,[1] the reason of the earlier doubt lay in the great difference of style observed between the first and unquestioned Epistle of Peter and this second. But Jerome has given the natural cause of this variety, namely, that Peter availed himself of different interpreters, as not being sufficiently at home

[1] Hier. *De Script. Eccl.* 1.

in the Greek language to write it with ease. And in fact two such interpreters were recognised in the earliest ages, Mark, who is mentioned in the first Epistle as the apostle's helper, and Glaucias.

Two questions are involved in deciding Peter's relation to the Church of Rome;—Did he found it? Did he die there? We must examine both. 1. The Roman Church must have been founded by an apostle, and that apostle can only have been Peter. Paul declares in his Epistle to the Romans that he had often withstood his longing to come to them, because he made a principle of only bringing the Gospel where Christ had not yet been preached, so as not to build on another man's foundation. But now, after the Church had been founded in the West, he was going into Spain, and would visit Rome on the way.[1] He was unwilling, then, at that time to undertake a regular apostolic office in Rome, "because the ground was already laid." By whom? Paul cannot possibly have meant by the chance visit of some nameless believer, or by those who returned from Jerusalem and related what they had heard there; he found irregular pre-announcements of that kind in most churches, to which he none the less devoted his special energies. He cannot, in a word, mean that it was his principle only to teach where no one had preached the Gospel before him, for, on the one hand, no intelligible ground for such a rule can be imagined; on the other, the contrary is proved by his labours in Antioch and Cyprus, and his anxious care

[1] Rom. xv. 20—24.

and earnest exhortations written to the community of Colossæ, which was unknown to him personally. He must refer, therefore, to his former agreement with the great apostles at Jerusalem, and the position he took towards them, according to which he desired to abstain from meddling with their work or building on a foundation laid by them. There can be no doubt, then, that it was Peter, perhaps accompanied by John, who had laid the foundation in Rome.

The formation of a Church at Rome, in the centre of the Empire, where the number of Jews was greater and their position more important than at any other town out of Judæa, excepting Alexandria, was far too important a matter to be left to chance. If the work of Philip in Samaria determined the apostles Peter and John to go there, to carry on and perfect what the deacon had begun, if the example of Alexandria showed them the expansive power of the Gospel and the importance and necessity of an ecclesiastical organization in a great capital, it is inconceivable that at Jerusalem, where Jews from Rome appeared at every festival, the idea of planting the Gospel in the great capital of the world should not have been seriously entertained. While all the principal churches have their tradition about the men to whom they owe their first foundation, Peter is marked out, both by the universal tradition of all churches and the special tradition of the Roman, as the founder and first ruler of that Church, and is said—which comes to the same thing—to have first gone to Rome under Claudius. Dionysius of Corinth, and

Irenæus, in the second century mention Peter as having laid the foundation of the Roman community. The planting of the Roman and Corinthian Church, says the former, was by Peter and Paul;[1] *i.e.* as Paul founded the Corinthian, Peter founded the Roman Church. Irenæus likewise ascribes to the two apostles the founding and ordering of these churches; and since all Paul did at Rome comes later, Peter always appears the special father of the Church there.

The Roman Church, when Paul wrote his Epistle, was in a different state, and is addressed by him in a different tone from other Churches. It was already complete, so to speak, and its faith spoken of over all the world.[2] There were no quarrels and party-strifes, Jews and Gentiles lived together in the Church as brethren, and Paul speaks in turn to the one and the other, but he speaks with an apologetic respectfulness, found in none of his other Epistles;—he excuses his "boldness" in admonishing them, appealing to his lofty mission as a minister of Christ among the Gentiles, although the main contents of the Epistle concern the Jews more than the Gentiles. He knows well that the Roman Christians are already filled with all knowledge. It is impossible Paul could have written in such terms at a time when the most imperfect knowledge of the new doctrine was found in many communities, and individuals, like Apollos, unless he had possessed in

[1] Dionys *ap. Eus.* ii. 25. φυτείαν is the word he uses; and in Iren. *ap. Eus.* v. 6, θεμελίωσαντες καὶ οἰκοδομήσαντες. Cf. Eus. v. 8.

[2] Rom. i. 8; xvi. 19.

the person of its founder and first preacher a guarantee for the purity and perfection of the Gospel planted there. It is only at the end that he introduces a very short and generally-worded warning against divisions.[1] Neither, again, had he any Judaizing opponents at Rome, as in so many other communities; and if we consider that the Church there was clearly not founded by his disciples, while yet its unity implied a well-ordered ecclesiastical organisation, such as then could only be set up by an apostle, we are brought back to Peter as the only founder who can be imagined. The notion of a gradual origin of the community without any particular founder, or of Aquila and Priscilla being its founders, or Paul himself, is self-evidently untenable.

The Jews had a particular quarter in the Transtiberine region of the city of Rome, where they had lived in part since 63 B.C., when Pompey brought thousands of them there as prisoners of war, and gave them their freedom. It was they who afterwards established the Synagogue of the Libertines at Jerusalem. At the death of the first Herod eight thousand of their fellow countrymen living in Rome had joined the deputies sent from Jerusalem. Since then the number had increased, and many proselytes of the gate were added to it. In 49 A.D. they were banished from Rome, because, in the words of the Roman historian, they "excited an incessant disturbance instigated by one Chrestus."[2] That quarrels about the Messiahship

[1] Rom. xvi. 17, 18. [2] Suet. Claud. 25.

of Christ and the disturbance caused by the formation of a Christian community are here meant, is so obvious an explanation that it is always recurred to. At the death of Claudius, soon afterwards, the exiles returned. When Paul wrote to the Romans, Aquila and Priscilla, who had been expelled by the Edict, were again there. But when Paul came to Rome, about the year 62, in consequence of his appeal to Cæsar, the chief men among the Roman Jews expressed themselves with evident reserve about the Christian community;—"we wish to hear what thou thinkest, for this sect is known to be everywhere spoken against." They had unmistakably been frightened and made cautious by the previous events and their sufferings under Claudius, and were unwilling to give any arms against themselves to the man who was soon to be heard before the Emperor or his delegates, protected by his Roman citizenship. Paul himself seems to have seen through their mistrust, for he assures them, that in appealing to the Emperor, he has no intention of accusing his own people.[1] Peter's journey to Rome must thus have preceded Claudius' decree of banishment.[2]

[1] Acts xxviii. 17—19.

[2] The "Acts" are silent about Peter's doings and fate from Cornelius's baptism till his imprisonment by Herod Agrippa. (Acts xi. 18—xii. 3). There is thus an interval of full three years for his journey to Rome to which tradition testifies, and his return to Jerusalem. (See Hug's *Introd.* ii. 273). His arrival at Rome comes in the beginning of Claudius' reign, not "secundo Claudii anno," as Jerome says, after the Chronicle of Eusebius; the better text of the Chronicle we now possess has not this date. (See Kunstmann, *Hist. Pol. Blättern*, 1857,

The testimony of Peter himself in his first Epistle raises to a certainty the fact of his having been at Rome. The letter is written from a city he calls Babylon. This cannot reasonably be understood of the Egyptian Babylon, a strong fortress and station of a Roman legion, and thus the question arises, whether it is Babylon on the Euphrates, or whether, according to a method of speech very natural to the Jews of that day from the usage of the Prophets, it means Rome. The latter is the belief of the ancient Church, following a tradition of the apostolic age to which Papias bears witness. That Peter had passed over the boundaries of the Roman Empire into Parthia to Babylon on the Euphrates, that there was already a Christian community there, and that from thence the Apostle salutes the believers to whom he is writing—this is more than improbable. Strabo and Pliny mention Babylon as "a great desert" which, chiefly from the neighbourhood of Seleucia and Ctesiphon, had become emptied of inhabitants.[1] The towns of Nearda and Nisibis were the principal Jewish settlements in the Babylonian Satrapy; the Jews had moved from Babylon to Seleucia several years before Peter could have come there, because they could not hold out against the Heathen inhabitants who were hostile to them; and soon afterwards another emigration took place on account of a pestilence. Five

ii. 596 sqq.). Orosius says more correctly (Hist. vii. 6) "Exordio regni Claudii." That Luke omits Peter's journey to Rome will surprise no one who remembers his omissions in the history of Paul.

[1] Plin. *Hist. Nat.* vi. 26. Strabo xvi. 738.

years later more than fifty thousand Jews were put to death in Seleucia by the Syrians and Greeks; the remainder went, not back to Babylon, but to Nearda and Nisibis;[1] and the only inference to be drawn from Josephus's history is that at the date of Peter's Epistle there were no longer any Jews in Babylon, and so, too, Agrippa, in his speech at the beginning of the Jewish war, knew of no Jews to name beyond the Jordan, except those in the province of Adiabene. That Mark, who was in "Babylon" with the apostle, was at Rome at the precise time when there is every reason to believe the Epistle was written, is clear from Paul mentioning him.[2] Soon after he was staying in Asia Minor, whence Paul recalled him to Rome shortly before his death.[3] There is nothing strange in Peter designating Rome in an Epistle by the name used in the poetical prophecy of the Apocalypse. A Jew who had grown up in a country town of Galilee with the language of the prophetic writings constantly in his ears, when he saw Rome with the abominations of Nero and the idolatry and moral corruptions prevalent there, could not but be most vividly reminded of the Old Testament descriptions of Babylon; and thus it was natural enough that, having at the beginning of his Epistle called the communities of Asia Minor "elect pilgrims," he should at the close call the community, whose salutation he imparted, their "fellow-elect in Babylon." And lastly, there are unmistakable indications throughout the

[1] Joseph. *Arch.* xviii. 9.
[2] Col. iv. 10. Philem. 24.
[3] 2 Tim. iv. 11.

Epistle of the approaching Neronic persecution, and Peter had good reason for using a local designation the Heathen would not understand, in order to avoid the danger inevitable for himself and the Roman Christians if a copy of the document should fall into their hands, as it easily might.

Peter died as a Martyr at Rome under Nero by crucifixion, and Origen mentions the special circumstance of his being nailed to the cross head downwards. This tradition is confirmed by the universal testimony of the whole ancient Church, and the grounds on which it has been assailed are not the result of historical criticism. The Gospel of John leaves no doubt as to the apostle's manner of death, for the Lord warned Peter prophetically in His last conversation with him of his end; in his old age his hands would be stretched and bound, and he would be carried whither he would not. The Evangelist adds that Jesus thereby signified by what manner of death Peter should glorify God.[1] And if, as this observation shows, Peter's martyrdom was a fact universally known in the Church at the end of the first century, so that the Evangelist found this mere intimation enough, it is impossible that the place where his death was endured to glorify the Lord should not have been equally notorious. But no other town than Rome has ever been mentioned; there is not the least trace of any other Church having ever claimed to be the place of the apostle's death. Dionysius of Corinth says (170 A.D.) that both the apostles suffered martyrdom in Rome at

[1] John xxi. 19.

the same time. The Roman Christian, Caius, says, (A.D. 200), in his treatise against Proclus the Montanist, that he can point out on the Vatican and on the road to Ostia the memorials (trophies) of the apostles (Peter and Paul) who founded this Church.[1] His contemporary Tertullian reckons among the prerogatives of the Roman Church, that "Peter was there conformed to the sufferings of the Lord."[2]

Peter suffered death either with Paul or after him. Clement of Rome fixes the time in saying, "Paul was executed under the rulers," for this points to the period of Nero's absence from Rome (A.D. 67) when the Prefect of the City, Helius Cæsarianus, and the pretorian Prefects, Nimphidius Sabinus and Tigellinus, were administering the government. The old tradition of Peter's twenty-five years episcopate in Rome arose from placing his journey thither in the year 42, the second of Claudius' reign, when he was set free from Agrippa's prison and escaped from Judæa; from then till his death in 67 is twenty-five years. But, of course, it must not be inferred that he spent all that time in Rome.

The first Heathen persecution, to which Peter and Paul fell victims, was the baptism of blood of the Roman Church; it befitted her dignity and importance to shine forth as the first and most severely tried of all. Hitherto the Christians had passed in the eyes of the Heathen, especially the authorities at Rome, for a Jewish sect formed through some internal schism in the bosom of Judaism. As such they could only appear

[1] Euseb. ii. 25. [2] Tertull. *de Præscript.* 36.

insignificant to the Romans. Tertullian expressly relates that Tiberius placed a motion before the Senate, on information received from Palestine, that Christ should be admitted among the Roman gods, and when the Senate rejected it still threatened punishment to those who accused Christians.[1] But this statement, improbable in itself, is contradicted by the silence of all other authorities. There seems never to have been any lack from the first of accusers of the Christians, partly Heathen, partly Jewish, for under Nero they were already "hated by the people on account of their shocking deeds, and taken for adherents of a new and criminal superstition,"[2] so that Christianity is first mentioned by Heathen historians as an abominable and corrupting misbelief, the Christians as "enemies of the human race;" and this was thenceforth the prevalent idea among educated Romans. So early had the enemies of Christianity spread those falsehoods about the *agape* and the Eucharist which afterwards demanded so many victims. The charge of misanthropy they inherited as a Jewish sect, for a similar reproach weighed on the whole Jewish people, and the veil of mystery, in which the Christians shrouded their assemblies for divine service from the beginning, fostered the suspicion that they indulged in a criminal secret worship.

A frightful conflagration which broke out July 19, A.D. 64, had in six days and seven nights laid three of the fourteen quarters of Rome in ashes and destroyed the greater part of seven. It was known that during

[1] Tertull. *Apol.* 5. [2] Tac. *Ann.* xv. 44. Suet. *Nero*, 16.

the fire, Nero, seated on a lofty tower, feasted his eyes on the magnificent spectacle of the sea of flame, and he was commonly believed to have been its author, though Tacitus leaves it undecided whether it was not accidental.[1] Terrified at the popular hatred, Nero looked for persons on whose shoulders the guilt could be laid; it was probably Jewish influence which suggested the Christians. For Nero's wife, Poppæa Sabina, who then ruled him was a proselyte,[2] and he was himself surrounded by Jewish magicians and soothsayers who afterwards assured him, connecting their prediction with the expected Messiah, that after his fall he would become ruler of Jerusalem, and live to see from thence the restoration of his former power.[3] At first some were seized who confessed themselves Christians, and on their statements, undoubtedly extorted by torture, a great number of others were taken and executed in a body. Some were crucified, some were sewn into animals' skins and torn to pieces by dogs, others were clothed in dresses dipped in combustible matter and burnt at night as torches in the Emperor's gardens. The persecution probably extended from Rome into some of the provinces, for when once the executions about the fire had begun, others, who were not accused of that crime, were put to death, according to Tacitus, because the universal hatred judged them worthy to die.

[1] [The evidence for the whole story about Nero is questioned by Mr. Lewes. See *Cornhill Magazine* for July 1863.—Tr.].

[2] Joseph. *Arch.* xx. 8.

[3] Suet. *Nero*, 40.

CHAPTER III.

ST. JAMES, ST. JUDE, ST. JOHN, AND THE REMAINING APOSTLES AND EVANGELISTS.

James had already suffered martyrdom in the year 62. He is the James who ranked next to Peter and John in the original Apostolic College, and was surnamed "the Just." According to the old tradition, Jesus had imparted to these three after his resurrection the *gnosis*, or deeper understanding of His doctrine, and they delivered it to their fellow apostles.[1] The risen Jesus appeared separately to James,[2] and Paul names him with Cephas and John as a pillar of the Church.[3] This James is called by pre-eminence "the Lord's brother;" his mother was the sister and namesake of the mother of Jesus, and had by her marriage with Clopas (Alphæus) four sons, James, Jude, Simon, and

[1] Clem. Alex. *ap. Euseb.* ii. 1.

[2] 1 Cor. xv. 7. The apostle names James without further description, but the Gospel of the Hebrews says it was the son of Alphæus, not of Zebedee.

[3] Gal. ii. 9.

Joses, and one daughter. Clopas, in John's Gospel, and Alphæus, in the Synoptics, is the same name.[1] The two ways of writing it in Greek arise from the different pronunciations, hard or soft, of the first letter in the Aramaic names, as may be seen in several names of the Alexandrian translation. It seems that after Clopas's death Joseph, the foster father of Jesus, received the widow, his sister-in-law, with her children into his house, so that the two families were united, and the cousins of Jesus reckoned as his brothers and sisters, according to the more extended use of the word among the Jews.[2] Mary herself, the Virgin's sister, appears among the women who attended on Jesus during His last stay in Jerusalem. According to Hegesippus, Alphæus or Clopas was also Joseph's brother; if so, the two brothers had married two sisters, and it was the more agreeable to Jewish law and custom for Joseph to adopt his brother's children. Two of these brothers or cousins of Jesus, James and Jude, were taken into the number of the apostles, the two others were not, clearly because for some time they would not believe on Him as the Messiah.[3] But they believed afterwards, and took part after the Ascension in preaching the Gospel, for Paul mentions after the apostles the brothers of Jesus as availing themselves of the right to be attended by women as "sisters" on their missionary journeys,[4] and Simon was second bishop of Jerusalem.

There is then no third James, no brother of the Lord

[1] John xix. 25. [2] Matt. xiii. 55. Mark vi. 3.
[3] John vii. 5. [4] 1 Cor. ix. 5.

and bishop of Jerusalem distinct from the apostle, the son of Alphæus. The oldest and most trustworthy tradition of the Church knows only of the sons of Zebedee and Alphæus. In the "Acts" of Luke there is certainly only one James spoken of after the son of Zebedee had been put to death;[1] but, if the James there named as head of the Mother Church was a different man from the apostle, Luke would have let the latter disappear without any trace, and have brought "the brother of Jesus" into his place without any notice of it; and, above all, nothing would then be known of the apostle —he would be a mere name in history.

Errors seem to have first crept into the Church tradition about James, through notices gathered from the apocryphal writings. In Hegesippus and Clement of Alexandria, it is still pure; they only know of two of that name, though Hegesippus says "many are mentioned." But he evidently identifies the bishop of Jerusalem with the son of Alphæus or Clopas. Confusion was caused by a notion Origen mentions[2] which came very early into the Church, partly founded on a misapprehension of their true relation, that the brothers of Jesus were sons of Joseph by a former marriage. This statement, which gained currency chiefly through the "Proto-Gospel of James," but was rejected as an apocryphal dream by Jerome, though seeming to be confirmed by the remark of Eusebius that James was equally called a son of Joseph, covered the fact that Joseph adopted his nephews after his brother's death. But the

[1] Acts xv.; xxi. [2] Orig. *in Matth.* Tom. xiii. 462.

"Apostolic Constitutions," by completely separating the bishop of Jerusalem from the Twelve, did most to determine the later views of many in the Greek Church. In this work, belonging in its present form to the fourth century, James, son of Alphæus, is always mentioned apart as an apostle, and next to him the Lord's brother and bishop of Jerusalem; we read in one place, "the thirteen apostles were appointed by the Lord; I, James, I, Clement, and others, by the apostles."[1] The appointment of James as first bishop of Jerusalem was made, according to an old tradition, by the three apostles, Peter, and[1] the sons of Zebedee, James and John.[2] Hegesippus says, that as long as the apostles remained in the holy city he shared with them the government of the Church of Jerusalem.[3] He it was who in the Apostolic Council about the Gentile Christians spoke first after Peter, and got the resolutions carried as to what they were to abstain from. He with Peter and John gave his hand to Paul, in token of fellowship in the apostolic office and belief. His mission and obligations towards the exclusively Jewish community at Jerusalem involved his being peculiarly the apostle of the Jews.

As he took no part personally in the conversion of the Gentiles, and had no occasion to live with them, but was constantly in the neighbourhood of the temple, he could display that zeal in the wonted observance of the law which made him appear to his contemporaries and to

[1] *Const. Apost.* ii. 55; vi. 16; viii. 16.
[2] Clem. Alex. *ap. Eus.* ii. 1. [3] Eus. *Hist.* ii. 23.

after ages the model of Jewish national piety, transfigured by the Gospel. After Peter's departure he was the ecclesiastical centre and final authority for the capital and for Palestine. He did not claim this high rank as "brother of the Lord," or as uniting that characteristic with the apostolate, for his brother Jude, who equally combined both characters, calls himself a servant of Christ and brother of James, regarding this last as a special privilege; Luke also calls him "Jude (brother) of James."[1]

He was so highly reverenced even by the unconverted Jew for his piety and asceticism, that the honourable name of "the Just" was universally given to him. Hegesippus, who had the older narratives of Jewish Christians before him, and whose account is in some places supplemented by Epiphanius, calls him a Nazarite who had been dedicated to God as such from his birth. He drank no wine or strong drink, he ate no flesh, and abstained from bathing and anointing with oil; he went barefoot, and wore no wool, but only one linen garment. His advice to the apostle Paul to associate himself in a Nazarite vow with some Jews makes this account of his being himself a strict Nazarite the more credible. He lived in perpetual virginity, so that the Ebionite sect exalted the state of voluntary celibacy solely on account of his example, a view they afterwards relinquished.[2] Latterly he was the only Chris-

[1] Acts i. 13; Luke vi. 16.
[2] Epiph. *Hær.* lxxviii. 13.

tian allowed to enter the temple.[1] There he might often be found on his knees praying for the forgiveness of his people, and he did this so often, and so long, that his knees became as hard as a camel's. So great was the fame of his sanctity that the people thronged him, only to touch the hem of his garment.

As to his death, Josephus says shortly that James, the brother of Jesus, was stoned at the suggestion of the High Priest, Ananias, after the death of the Roman procurator, Festus, and before the arrival of his successor, Albinus, A.D. 62. In order to terrify him he was placed on the parapet of the temple, and asked which was the door of Jesus? *i.e.* what, according to the doctrine of Jesus, was the entrance to eternal life? On his confession that Jesus sits in heaven on the right hand of Almighty power, and will come again, they cast him down from the pinnacle of the temple, and stoned him beneath; and, while he was yet praying for his murderers, a fuller killed him with his felt-stick. This account so far agrees with that of Josephus, that it is said in the Jewish law a criminal condemned to stoning shall be thrown down by the witnesses from a height, and, if he still lives, they shall cast a great stone on his heart, and the people around shall stone

[1] εἰς τὰ ἅγια, as Hegesippus says, *i.e.*, where the priests performed their daily ministry. Epiphanius and Rufinus first made it "the most holy place," which is clearly inconceivable. See Ruinart, *not. ad Acta. MM.*, p. 4, Ed. Amstel. On that view James would have been the only person ever allowed, without being a priest, or member of a Levitical or priestly family, to enter this inner chamber of the temple.

him till he dies.[1] After James' death Ananias had several persons condemned by the Synagogue, and stoned as breakers of the Law, that is Christians, till king Agrippa deposed him from the priesthood in consequence. We see that the death of James, and what immediately followed, was a result of the last great crisis in Jerusalem, shortly before the outbreak of the war and destruction of the City. Hegesippus observes that many, even of the chief men among the people, were converted on the testimony of James; but the mass, both of people and rulers, persisted in their enmity against Christianity, and this brought on the catastrophe.

The Epistle of James is addressed to "the Twelve tribes in the Dispersion," the Jews already converted who lived scattered among the Heathen outside the borders of Palestine, and is thus strictly confined to Jewish Christians, with special reference to communities, such as there might be in Syria, composed wholly or principally of Jews. The readiness and easy flow of the original Greek style proves, unless James, like Peter, availed himself of an Hellenistic Jew as interpreter, how widely-spread was the power of writing Greek among the Jews of Palestine. The document is further distinguished by a strength and richness of thought, a sententious, figurative, and often poetical elevation of speech, and a manifold and visible coincidence with the Sermon on the Mount. It is partly devoted to combating a doctrinal error (the misapprehension and misapplication of the doctrine of justifica-

[1] Joseph. *Sanhedrin*, cap. 16 et 15.

tion by faith), partly, and chiefly, to the censure and correction of moral faults, namely, the sharp distinction between rich and poor, and the preference of the former in religious assemblies. The apostle calls Christianity the law of freedom, the royal law of love which God writes on man's heart by faith; but otherwise the weightiest New Testament doctrines are not once touched on. Yet this Epistle contains more references to the discourses of Jesus, and more quotations of His words, than all the other apostolic Epistles put together.

The Epistle of James was seldom quoted in the first two centuries, though Hermas knew it; it already had its place in the Syrian Peschito,[1] and Clement of Alexandria had explained it with the rest.[2] Origen is the first who expressly assigns it to James.[3] In the Western Church it only came into use, so far as we know, at the end of the fourth century. Eusebius reckons it among disputed writings, but observes that it is read publicly in very many Churches, and gives as the reason for doubting its canonicity, that it is seldom quoted by earlier writers.[4] Jerome says that it only gained authority gradually, and in course of time.[5] The suspicion he mentions, that the Epistle had been published by another under the name of James, may have existed for some time in the West; there is no trace of it in the East, and no other author was ever named.

[1] Clem. *Ep.* i. 10. Herm. *Past.* viii. 6.
[2] Eus. vi. 14.
[3] Orig. *Opp.* iv. 306.
[4] Eus. iii. 25.
[5] Hieron. *De Virg. Ill.* 2.

Another brother or cousin of Jesus, Jude, the brother of James and son of Clopas, Jesus' uncle, and Mary, was numbered among the apostles by the name of Thaddæus or Lebbæus. The expression of Hegesippus, that he was called the Lord's brother "after the flesh," means that their relationship concerns only the Man Jesus, who as Son of God had no relations.[1] His short Epistle with a general superscription is, however, addressed specially to the communities of Asia Minor, and was composed after the death of Peter, Paul, and James, to oppose the errors of the Gnostic Antinomian teachers there by the testimony of a surviving apostle. It is mainly occupied with describing these seducers and false teachers, their carnal mind, their misuse of the Christian *agape*, and their blasphemies; and seeks to guard Christians against their enticements by reminding them of the predictions of the apostles that such men would enter in and devastate the Church, as was now come to pass. And here Jude often recurs to the thoughts and even the words of Peter's Second Epistle, only that he clenches by the teaching of experience the more general intimations of Peter. The Epistle has always been received as genuine in the Church, and quoted from early times by name (as by Tertullian, Clement, and Origen)

[1] Eus. *Hist.* iii. 20. When the Apostle Jude is called (Luke vi. 16. Acts i. 13) Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου, this does not mean "a son of James," for then the writer of the Epistle would be a different person from the apostle, but we must supply ἀδελφός; and we need have no scruple about it, since it was usual among the first Christians, as the title of the Epistle itself shows, to distinguish this Jude from his namesake, as brother of James, who was so celebrated and universally known.

and if Eusebius reckons it among disputed writings, and some doubts have been expressed about it; this arose only from the author having used two apocryphal Jewish writings of later date, the Book of Enoch, and the "Anabasis" of Moses.[1]

It seems as if with the martyrdom of James the time allowed for the conversion of the Jewish nation closed. For it was now clear that so long as Jerusalem and the temple stood, and the Jewish polity with its theocratic character survived, the mass of the Jews could not be brought to believe on their true Messiah. In fact, since James was put to death in Jerusalem, the state of the Christians grew daily more intolerable. The Epistle to the Hebrews describes a condition where not a few fell away, yielding to the enmity of their countrymen. The religious enthusiasm and the activity of the Pharisaic Zealots, which at last arrayed the whole people in war against the Romans, and indeed against all foreigners, made the peaceful continuance of the Christian community in Judæa and Galilee impossible, even though its members constantly testified their adherence to the Jewish polity in Church and State, by observing the ceremonial law. The worshippers of a Messiah who came in poverty and loneliness, and died on a cross, could no longer dwell peacefully by the side of men who were even now looking with unbounded confidence and impatience for a Messiah armed with the sword, to lead them to victory over the Romans,—who still looked for

[1] The statement about the Archangel Michael and Satan came from this document, according to Origen. (*De Princip.* iii. 2).

Him, when the flames of the temple were crashing over their heads.

For the Jewish nation now drew more and more upon itself the fulfilment of the counsel and judgment of God. In the year 66 a tumult broke out against the Roman rule, which led to the siege and taking of Jerusalem. The Christian community there was not involved in this catastrophe. Christ had before warned His disciples, when they saw the abomination of desolation in the holy City, and Jerusalem surrounded by hostile armies, to quit the city and flee to the mountains.[1] Eusebius adds that, shortly before all egress was closed, a special revelation by the mouth of the most venerated among the Christians at Jerusalem commanded them to depart and settle at Pella in Perœa. The Christians in the country districts of Judæa and Galilee most likely followed the example of their brethren in Jerusalem. Pella was a Greek colony, and there accordingly the first Gentile influences may have been brought to bear on the hitherto exclusively Jewish Christians of Jerusalem.

The fall of the temple was an event of critical importance for the young Church. Judaism required essentially and above all things a temple for its divine service and religious life, and this temple could be but one, and in one place only in the world. When the temple sunk in flames, the practice of the ritual law became impossible in its most integral parts, the sacrifices which were the holiest thing in Jewish religion had to cease, the priesthood was reduced to an honorary

[1] Matt. xxiv. 15, 16.

sinecure and empty name. The Christians did not share the delusion so many Jews clung to that God would suddenly restore the temple by miracle; they recognized in its destruction a providence of God and a sign that the end of the ceremonial law was come, that Christian doctrine was thereby completely taken out and separated from the maternal womb of Judaism. The Jewish people had lost everything that had once been their special prerogative. The last relics of common national polity and civil existence were annihilated, there was no longer centre or capital; the law indeed remained, but a law, which, so to speak, prohibited itself, for no single Israelite could observe its ritual ordinances without breaking it. This could not but appear to all Christians, surely also to many Jews, as a solemn rejection by God, declared in deeds, of the people He had formerly chosen out of all the nations of the earth.

The majority of the people resolved, even after city and temple were destroyed, to persevere in their customary round of hopes and imaginations. The event was universally accepted as a terrible judgment of God upon the nation, but the real explanation of their guilt they had not discovered. That the catastrophe was the fulfilment of their own sentence on themselves, when they cried, "His blood be on us and on our children"—that they understood not. Their teachers assured them this misfortune had come from their lack of zeal for the law and their inadequate observance of it. The mass of Jews had no taste for a religion which met them on the

very threshhold with the admonition to renounce all their rights and privileges, to humble themselves to an equality with the uncircumcised Gentiles, and to acknowledge themselves sinners in all the righteousness of the law, who needed, no less than the Heathen, pardoning grace. Since the beginning of the great struggle the Gentiles had almost everywhere displayed a burning hatred against the Jews, and in many places they had fallen victims to their bloodthirsty fury and been massacred in hundreds and thousands. So much the deeper and more inextinguishably did the feeling of hatred and vengeance against the uncircumcised glow within their breasts, and a faith whose first condition was a command of love for all men, and which sometimes bade them submit to an uncircumcised man as bishop or presbyter, was intolerable to them. That word—"the uncircumcised shall be rooted out of God's people"—was always before their minds, and to eat in company with one not a Jew was defilement. Their feasts, indeed, and much of their ceremonies had become an empty shell without kernel, through the destruction of the temple and cessation of sacrifice, but they waited long, from year to year, for the miraculous restoration of the fallen temple. Meanwhile the ruins of the ceremonial law were so much the more resolutely clung to as the bulwark behind which their nationality entrenched itself, and so firmly was it cemented by the common hope, by the prejudice and pride of the sons of Abraham, and their historical recollections, that all the blows of the Roman power, all the unexampled severity the

Romans exercised over them alone of conquered nations, their being torn from their native soil and scattered over all lands, the humiliation of paying tribute to the temple of Jupiter on the Capitol,—all this could not break it down.

All, henceforth, who became Christians ceased to belong to their nation, in whose eyes they were leaves and twigs fallen from the parent tree, while the tree lived on. The inexhaustible fruitfulness of this people richly supplied all such losses, and they had a fixed point of religious union in their Sanhedrim, which sat at Jamnia after the destruction of Jerusalem. And thus was developed the credulity and readiness to discover and adopt silly legends, that flattered the vanity, presumption, and carnal mind of the Jews, of which the Talmud literature, in its gradual formation, gives such abundant evidence. This attempt was natural with a people who possessed so rich and wonderful a past, while their present was so poor and empty, and who, therefore, would always be labouring to conceal the contradiction between their continued claim to be the one chosen people of God, and the fact that every token of divine rejection pressed on this darling of the deity among the nations, that it was the most severely maltreated and trodden down of all peoples. There was added the confident expectation that at the Messiah's advent all the oppressions they had endured would be richly compensated, and their imagination delighted to paint this compensation after a sufficiently carnal fashion, according to their prevalent idea.

From the destruction of Jerusalem, A.D. 70, all that

we know of the Church for the last thirty years of the first century connects itself naturally with the apostle John. It was his lot long to survive the other apostles, so that the young Church should not want in those later days the high authority of an apostle and eyewitness of Christ. Ecclesiastical tradition makes him a relation of Jesus, through his mother Salome; he was the most intimate disciple of Jesus with Peter and his brother James, the darling of the Lord, who lay on His breast at the Last Supper, the one disciple present at the crucifixion, and whose loyalty Jesus rewarded by consigning His mother to his care. When he left Jerusalem for good is uncertain, but at Paul's last visit, in 58, he must already have gone.

John seems to have been closely united with Peter, and, so long as we have any account of their common work, is always named with him as his companion; Paul designates them, together with James, pillars of the Church. He afterwards took Ephesus for his headquarters, and there superintended the Churches on the coasts of Asia.[1] Polycarp and Ignatius were among the disciples he educated there. He was brought to Rome under Domitian, and there, as Tertullian and Jerome relate, thrown into boiling oil, and when he came out unhurt, banished to the island of Patmos, in the year 95. After Domitian's death he returned to Ephesus.[2] Three incidents are recorded of the apostle's

[1] Polyc. *ap. Eus.* v. 21. Iren. iii. 3, 4. [2] Eus. iii. 18. Orig. *Comm. in Matt. Opp.* iii. 729. Tert. *Præscr.* 36. Hieron. *adv. Jov.* i. 26. *Comm. in Matt.* xx. 22.

later life;—the horror he expressed of the false teacher Cerinthus, when he had gone into the same bath with him; his constant repetition of the words, "Children love one another," in the assemblies; and, lastly, his bringing back and converting the youth who, after being baptised, had fallen in with robbers and become leader of a band.[1] John died under Trajan, nearly a hundred years old, A.D. 100 or 101.

The first Epistle of John is a supplement, a kind of appendix to his Gospel. The apostle reminds men, with evident reference to Paul, that it is the last hour, and that in token of it many antichrists had appeared, namely, Gnostic seducers, who dissolved the unity of Christ's Person, dividing the man Jesus from the divine Christ who had only temporarily dwelt in him. John insists against them that the Son of God has appeared in the flesh. The discourse passes at times into the tone of a treatise, but always reverts to the form of an address, and through its clear teaching on the divine source of the Christian religion, and the foundations and blessedness of a Christian life, expressing itself in active love, attains to universal interest as a doctrinal writing. This first Epistle was never questioned in the Church, or ascribed to any other than the apostle John, though the author has not named himself. But he characterises himself at the beginning as an eyewitness of the life of Jesus, and there are expressions which betray his authorship.[2] The whole tone, the more contemplative habit of mind,

[1] Iren. iii. 3. Hieron. *Comm. in Gal.* vi. Clem. Alex. *Quis dives salv.* 42.
[2] 1 John i. 3, 5; iv. 14.

and the use of abstract terms mark the author of the fourth Gospel.

On the other hand, doubts arose very early in the Church; as to whether the two short and very similar missives, called in the Canon the Second and Third Epistle of John, are really his. The author only designates himself "the Presbyter," but the use of the word in this Epistle shows that he cannot have understood this title in the usual ecclesiastical sense, as though he were only one among many presbyters of a community. Clearly the writer meant thereby to express the singular and lofty position he held in the circle around him, as the teacher venerable for his old age, and the last of the apostles; for the use of this word in the Church, both then and later, combined the notion of office and of age. The Second Epistle impresses us as being addressed to a community, for, if a private family were signified by "the elect lady and her children," the apostle could not have said that not only he but all who knew the truth loved the children of this elect one. It is thus a community or part of one that is spoken of;[1] the apostle rejoices that they walk in the truth, and warns them against false teachers who deny Christ's appearance in the flesh. The Third Epistle, to Caius, denounces the conduct of a bishop, Diotrephes, who was hostile to John, and had not only repulsed brethren sent by the apostle with a letter, but cast out of the communion of the Church

[1] The words εὕρηκα ἐκ τῶν τέκνων σου (2 John, 4), obviously imply something more than a family consisting of mother and children.

those who were ready to receive them; John announces his intention of visiting the community in person.

To the Epistles of John are joined in the Canon his prophetical book, the "Revelation." It is unquestionably his work. The author calls himself John, and gives evidence of being a disciple of the Lord who at the time of writing the book held high official authority in the Churches on the Asiatic coast. Since another John was known of in the Church, a presbyter who was a contemporary of the apostle and disciple of Jesus, and who lived at Ephesus, where his grave could be seen next to the apostle's, it was an early conjecture that this presbyter might be the author of the Apocalypse. But this conjecture has no ground in history or tradition, and has merely arisen from the desire to ascribe this prophetical book to a different author from the apostle, to whom the oldest tradition of the Church unmistakably attributes it. There is weight in the fact of Papias mentioning it as divinely inspired, and the testimony of Justin, Melito, Irenæus, Hippolytus, and the Muratorian Canon is decisive. The apostle lived till Trajan's time, at Ephesus; about forty years later, Justin in the same city mentions the Apocalypse as his undoubted work.[1] This implies that the apostle was recognised as the author in his own Church, where the Apocalypse first appeared, and from whence it was circulated elsewhere. Shortly afterwards, Melito, bishop of Sardis, a Church to which one of the apocalyptic messages is addressed, wrote a special treatise on the book, in which

[1] Euseb. iv. 18. Justin. *Dial. contr. Tryph.* p. 308.

John is named, without being further described, as the author. The statement of Irenæus depends on his master Polycarp, John's disciple; and that he in calling the author, "John, the Lord's disciple," meant no other than the apostle, is certain, from his appealing to the testimony of those who had seen John.[1] And it is clear that the Apocalypse was a book much read and talked of on the coasts of Asia, where those eyewitnesses lived, during their lifetime, from the dispute about the number 666 which Irenæus defends against the reading 616 on the evidence of these contemporaries. There can then have been but one tradition in the birthplace of the "Revelation" about its authorship, and this pointed only to the apostle. Otherwise the John who wrote the book would have been discriminated from the first, either as the apostle or as one who, though not an apostle, was a disciple of Jesus and a presbyter. The Muratorian Canon and Hippolytus, who wrote a special treatise in defence of the Gospel and Revelation of John, prove that the Roman Church recognised it as the apostle's work. Caius, therefore, cannot be taken as a witness of the Roman tradition on this point. Clement and Origen represent the tradition of the Alexandrian Church.[2] And thus, till the middle of the third century, Caius, at Rome, stands alone, who, in his anti-millennial zeal ascribes the Apocalypse to the heretic Cerinthus.[3] The "Alogi" [4] in Asia

[1] Iren. v. 30.

[2] Clem. *Strom.* vi. p. 667; ii. p. 207. Orig. *ap. Eus.* vi. 25. *Comm. in Joann.* Opp. iv. 17.

[3] Caius *ap. Eus.* iii. 28. Theodoret *Hær. Fab.* ii. 3.

[4] [The Ἄλογοι were an early sect, only known from a passage of Epiphanius. They are discussed in Döllinger's *Hippolytus*.—Tr.]

Minor, who denied the apostle's authorship of Gospel and Apocalypse, belong to a later period. Dionysius of Alexandria (247—264) was the first to shake somewhat the hitherto uniform tradition of the Church. Deceived by the obscurity of the book, and anxious to deprive the Egyptian Chiliasts of what seemed to be their most effective weapons, he affirmed, not on historical, but on internal and negative grounds, that the Apocalypse could not be the apostle's work, partly because he does not name himself in his Gospel or Epistles, whereas here the name is given, partly because there is too much difference in language, style, and thought from the Gospel and Epistles.[1] He thence conjectured that another John, the presbyter at Ephesus, might be the author. From that time a doubt, and in some sense dislike, of the book appears in the Eastern Church; it was often omitted in lists of the canonical books, and in translations like the Peschito, while the Western Church continued to acknowledge it. Yet in the fourth century the fact of the apostle's authorship was no longer doubted in the East.

According to Irenæus, who had the best opportunities of knowing through his master, Polycarp, John's disciple, the Apocalypse was composed towards the end of Domitian's reign, about 96 A.D.; and since he appeals, in connexion with the number 666, to persons who had seen John, his evidence about the date is trustworthy. John himself says that he received the Revelation in Patmos, where he was, "for the word of God, and the

[1] Eus. vii. 24, 25.

testimony of Jesus." The frequent attempts to fix an earlier date for the Apocalypse, under Nero, Galba, or Vespasian, rest on arbitrary interpretations of a few obscure passages. The important variations of style between the Gospel and Revelation are explained by John having used a different translator for the one and the other. For it is highly probable that he, the son of a Galilean fisherman, was not sufficiently at home in Greek to put these writings into shape without the aid of Hellenists. Yet he may have had an assistant for his Epistles and Gospel, and drawn up his last work, the Apocalypse, by himself.

The Apocalypse implies throughout a bitter persecution only just over. The blood of the martyrs had flowed abundantly. One of them is mentioned by name, Antipas, who had been slain as a faithful witness among the Christians of Pergamos.[1] The prophet sees under the heavenly altar the souls of the witnesses slain for the word and testimony of God, who, after the Roman custom, were beheaded with the axe;[2] and they are told that their number shall become greater. In the Neronian persecution other and more cruel kinds of death were practiced. The apostle calls himself a companion of the Churches in their tribulation, and the angels, or bishops, of Pergamos and Philadelphia are especially praised for not having denied the faith of Christ. The great harlot, Babylon or Rome, is already drunk with the blood of the saints and witnesses of

[1] Apoc. ii. 13. [2] Ib. xx. 4.

Jesus, and the beast blasphemes God, and makes all the dwellers on the earth worship it.[1]

There can be no mistake here as to Domitian and his persecution being meant. He was the first after Caligula who claimed the formal title of, "God," and began all his letters, "Our Lord and God commands;" he compelled every one to address him as such by word of mouth or in writing, and had statues put up to himself in the sanctuary of the temple, and whole herds of animals sacrificed to him.[2] We know very little of this persecution, but it is referred to by Dio Cassius who says that a cousin of the Emperor, the consul Flavius Clemens, and many others were condemned, some to death, some to confiscation of property, on the charge of atheism and for Jewish usages;[3] for the Christians always passed with the Romans for a Jewish sect who combined denial of the gods with Judaism. It is certain that Domitian from political suspicions had the remaining members of David's family put to death, though he spared two relations of Jesus, who in proof of their poverty and innocence showed him the hardness of their hands.[4] The persecution meantime was so severe that even a Heathen writer of the period, Bruttius, speaks of the number of Christians who suffered, and Clement of Rome mentions a great number of elect, even

[1] Apoc. i. 9; ii. 13; xvii.
[2] Sueton. *Domit.* 13. Plin. *Paneg.* 33, 52.
[3] Dio. Cass. lxvii. 15.
[4] Eus. iii. 19, 20.

women, who, "through endurance of shameful penalties and tortures gave us the most glorious examples."[1]

During this persecution, or immediately after it, and while the impression was still vivid on his mind, with the foresight of yet worse persecutions to come, John saw and wrote his Revelation. He recounts as a witness by divine command what was shown him in a cycle of visions. He discloses the mysteries of the judgments and dispensations of God, hidden in a sealed book. The acts of the glorified Redeemer, the sufferings of believers, and the punishment of the powers of darkness and their instruments among Jews and Heathen form the general subject of this book, designed primarily for the Churches of Asia Minor. The believers were thereby to be encouraged to patience and perseverance under the dangers and persecutions present and future, and to faithfulness and firmness in their profession. The prophet exhibits the Church triumphant in heaven, while he proclaims to the Church militant on earth the approach of most terrible trials. The whole book is full of references to the Old Testament, of allusions and reminiscences. Most of its imagery is borrowed from Ezekiel, Daniel, and other Old Testament prophets.

The book opens with seven Epistles addressed by the prophet in the name of Christ to the rulers of the Churches of Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamos, Thyatira, Sardis, Philadelphia, and Laodicea, referring to the circumstances, defects, and dangers of those communities, or to the personal qualities, virtues, and faults of their

[1] Eus. *Chron.* i. 2.; ad. Olymp. 218. Clem. *Ep. ad Cor.* 6.

bishops. In the series of visions which follows, great physical and political commotions and catastrophes, and all conceivable horrors of nature and plagues of the dwellers upon earth, are described under the richest and boldest symbolic imagery; and it soon becomes clear that any literal and concrete interpretation of these events is inadmissible. Four riders appear—Victory, War, Famine, Pestilence; earth, sea, rivers, fountains, the very heavenly bodies, are struck with horrible plagues; poisonous locusts and troops of destroying horsemen torment men. Meanwhile, the prophet opens his eyes on the Church in heaven, and shows how all that happens in and for the earthly Church has its ground in the counsels of God and the events of the unseen world, and how the Church invisible in heaven is in full enjoyment of its promised blessings, while on earth it must endure a painful and unceasing struggle.

The prophet represents in three successive periods the development and fulfilment of the Kingdom of God and of His judgment on the Church's enemies. First comes the time of the Heathen persecutions, whose temporary character is expressed by the number "three and a half," which is half the mystical seven. Then follows the long period of the victory of Christ and the Church, during which Satan is bound, and his influence over the powers of the world broken, while the Church under the dominion of Christ and the Saints in heaven flourishes and increases on earth; this is the reign of a thousand years. The last period succeeds, when Satan again makes war upon the Church with all

his power; it is the time of a great strife, and of the dissolution of the present order of the world. The numbers are throughout symbolical, and they limit and fix all the rest. The number seven prevails throughout the whole book, linked together in the threefold cycle of the seven seals, trumpets, and vials of wrath. The Church purified through a sevenfold trial and persecution appears at last as Jerusalem coming down from heaven. The number of half seven borrowed from Daniel (three years and a half, forty-two months, one thousand two hundred and sixty days) stands for a more limited period, as a thousand years for one of unlimited duration. The attempt to extract fixed chronological dates from the Apocalypse, or to make a prophetic compendium of the history of the world or the Church out of it, rests on a radical misapprehension of the book. The whole time from the conquest of Christianity in the Roman Empire till the end of the present course of the world is presented under two aspects, the binding of Satan, and the rule of Christ and the Saints in heaven over the Church.

The Lamb that was slain and lives for evermore, the Lion of the tribe of Judah who hath overcome and by His victory changed the fate and history of the world, He alone is worthy to open the book of the future closed with seven seals. And as He takes the book out of the Father's right hand all in heaven fall down to worship Him, praising God and the Lamb. Those slain in the persecution, whose souls John sees under the altar in heaven, are told that their number shall be increased by

the victims of coming persecutions, and are already allowed to take part in the heavenly solemnity before God and the Lamb. At the same time, the believers delivered out of the great tribulation are sealed, as the Twelve tribes of the true Israel, and as being under God's peculiar care; and the prophet beholds an innumerable multitude of blessed Martyrs out of all peoples, with palm branches in their hands, before the throne, praising God and the Lamb.[1]

The purification of the Church in the fire of Heathen persecution is now represented under another form. John is to measure the temple, the altar, and the worshippers; they are guarded as the inner sanctuary of the Church, and withdrawn from Heathen fury; but the outer court of the temple, and the holy city itself—the external Church—are given over to the Gentiles, who shall tread it under foot for the allotted period. At the same time, within the Empire, that great city which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt, the Christian witnesses arise endued with power from on high and invincible.[2] And if the witnesses fall victims to the

[1] Apoc. vi. 9 sqq.; vii. 2 sqq.

[2] Apoc. xi. 1 sqq. John clearly contrasts the holy city (the Church) with the great city (or Roman Empire), the spiritual Sodom and Egypt. That he is not speaking of any particular city, and cannot mean Jerusalem, appears from the comparison with a country, viz., Egypt; and again, he certainly would not describe Jerusalem in the same breath as holy and as Sodom. When it is said, that the Lord of the two witnesses was crucified in the great city, the reason for mentioning His death is to remind the witnesses (or preachers of the Gospel) that they can expect no other fate in the Roman Empire than what there befel their Lord. Nor could the prophet apply to an

Heathen power of Rome, the beast from the abyss, if their corpses lie unburied for the scorn and joy of the many Gentile tribes and tongues, this Heathen triumph shall be turned into horror; the Christian testimony, seemingly destroyed in its instruments, is raised again, the witnesses who were slain ascend into heaven, and the Roman Empire is simultaneously surprised by great catastrophes, civil wars and revolutions.

John now describes under different imagery the same development of the Church; and the struggle of hostile powers against it and against Christ. He goes back to the birth of Christ. A woman clothed with the sun, and the moon beneath her feet, and a crown of twelve stars upon her head—the Church, represented by John in her earlier Jewish and present Christian form—gives birth to Messiah after bitter pains of labour. Satan, the great red dragon with seven heads, ten horns, and seven crowns upon his heads, waits to devour the Child as soon as it is born, through his instrument, Herod. But the Child was caught up to God and to His throne, while the mother (the Church), like the Synagogue before in the persecution of Antiochus, escapes for a fixed time into the wilderness. The great struggle with the arch enemies of the Church is now first decided in heaven. The dragon and his followers are overcome by the archangel Michael, the champion of the Church,

occurrence confined to the city of Jerusalem what is said (vv. 9, 10), that many of the peoples, kindreds, tongues and nations (so had he before called the inhabitants of the Roman Empire) should see their dead bodies, and that the dwellers upon earth who were tormented by the two Prophets should rejoice over their death.

and cast out of heaven upon the earth.[1] If Michael is here represented as the Conqueror, so, too, are the believers themselves; they have overcome Satan, the constant accuser of the brethren, through the atoning blood of the Lamb, and through the testimony of their martyrdom, and the Church Triumphant in heaven rejoices over the victory of the combatants on earth.

This conquest of the believers is followed by a long and severe struggle, which the prophet describes standing on the shore of the sea.[2] The instruments of Satan appear. First rises from the sea a beast compounded of leopard, bear, and lion, having seven heads and ten horns, and as many crowns, and on his heads a name of blasphemy. This is the Roman Empire hostile to Christianity. The seven heads are seven mountains (the hills Rome stands on), and also seven rulers. The dragon (Satan) gives it power over the peoples of the earth, a throne, and great might to contend with the Saints. The dragon and the beast are worshipped by men. The beast blasphemes God and oppresses believers, who are to wait patiently, and to keep their faith, looking for the future recompense. Another beast comes up out of the earth, the false prophet.[3] This is the new Heathen sects of philosophy, using magic and theurgy with the aim of confirming and restoring the Heathen religious institutions. This beast speaks like the dragon, and seduces men by his magical arts and wonders, so that they worship the first beast, and set up

[1] Apoc. xii. 1 sqq.
[2] Apoc. xiii. 1 sqq.
[3] Apoc. xvi. 13; xix. 20.

images to him.[1] Whoever will not worship the image of the beast is killed, and whoever does not receive the mark of the beast is excluded from all civil rights.

The Lamb, and a hundred and forty-four thousand with Him, marked as children of God and Saints with His Father's name, stand on Mount Sion, over against the enemy. These are not the same who were before mentioned as sealed out of the Twelve tribes of Israel; they are "redeemed from among men" in general, and follow the Lamb whithersoever He goeth, as being pure, and undefiled with women. An angel flies through heaven with the everlasting Gospel of the fulfilment of the kingdom and approach of judgment; a second angel proclaims the fall of Babylon (Rome); a third threatens the worshippers of the beast with the wrath and chastisement of God. Under various figures of a harvest, a vintage with the wine-press, and of the seven vials of wrath poured out, the prophet describes the divine judgment on Heathen idolatry and the triumph of Christianity.[2]

Then John sees in a wilderness a woman sitting on the beast (the Roman Empire) gorgeously arrayed and drunken with the blood of the holy martyrs, having in her hand a golden cup full of abominations and filthiness. This is the seven-hilled Rome, the great Babylon, the mother of all idolatry. The beast has a deadly wound

[1] Compare *Heidenthum und Judenthum*, p. 614 on the prevalent worship of Emperors, living and dead, and of the goddess Rome, especially in the towns of Asia Minor, under the eyes of John.

[2] Apoc. xiv. 1 sqq. Cf. vii. 4 sqq.

on his head which is healed again. Ten kings, represented by the ten horns, hate the harlot, but give their power and strength to the beast, and receive dominion for one hour with the beast; on the one hand, they shall lay waste Rome as instruments of God, on the other, they shall strive with the Lamb and be overcome. This apparently refers to the nations and kings who, after being for awhile dependent on Rome, or allied to it, at length dismembered the Empire, took the capital, and, after oppressing the Christians, were converted to the Gospel. An angel from heaven now proclaims the fall of Babylon, the great city; the believers are to come out of her, for she is doomed to destruction. The kings who committed fornication with her shall bewail her, the merchants and shipmasters shall mourn for the desolation of the city of all riches, merchandise, and luxury. But the Saints, the Apostles, and the Prophets, rejoice in heaven. Then are the foreign kings overcome who had wrought judgment on the idolatrous city drunken with blood, and Christ Himself appears as King and Lord at the head of the armies of heaven, with the symbol and attributes of Judge of the world. The beast and the kings of the earth strive with Him; beast and false prophet are cast into the lake of fire, but the kings that help the beast are slain with the sword that proceeds out of the mouth of Christ.[1]

Satan is now bound and cast into the pit for a long period of a thousand years; his power as ruler of this world is broken with the overthrow of Heathenism in

[1] Apoc. xvii. xviii. xix.

the Roman Empire, he can no longer seduce the nations to commit idolatry. Meanwhile, the martyrs and saints who have not worshipped the beast reign with Christ in heaven; this is the first resurrection, figurative, not bodily, corresponding to the first death, and hence the apostle sees only the *souls* of those who are risen, *i.e.* passed from the militant to the Triumphant Church.[1] On earth this is the period of the increase, and, in a sense, dominion, of the Church; the sun-clothed woman is no more hidden in the wilderness, the three years and a-half of her trial are over, the Church possesses the countries, the peoples, and the property which before belonged to her enemies.

At the end of this long period (the present dispensation of the world), Satan will be unchained and go forth in person from his prison to deceive the nations—not the beast or the false prophet, for the Old Heathen idolatry is passed away. He leads numberless hosts to war against the Church, the City of the Saints, but they are quelled, and Satan is cast for ever into the lake of fire, where are the beast and the false prophet. And now comes the real universal resurrection (the first was figurative and partial), and the judgment of the world results in the birth throes of a new and transfigured earth. Christ takes His Father's throne and sits in judgment. They whose names are not written in the book of life incur eternal death, and lastly, death and Hell are cast into the lake of fire; the eternal separation of the two kingdoms is fulfilled. John sees the new

[1] Apoc. xx. 4.

Jerusalem, the Church Triumphant, coming down from heaven in her glory as a bride adorned. The heavenly and the earthly Jerusalem henceforth are one, heaven is become earth, and earth is heaven. Sin and evil are destroyed and cast for ever out of the new Jerusalem, where God reveals Himself in light and glory. The book closes with a warning that none may add to the words of this prophecy or take from them, and with the promise that the Lord will come quickly.[1]

The messages to the seven churches of Asia Minor point to disorders caused in some of them by those false doctrines whose beginnings Paul had already clearly spoken of, and whose further development he had foretold. From the first, there had advanced alongside of the outward enmity of Heathen powers an inward danger and affliction of the Church, through laboured attempts to disfigure the doctrine laid down by the apostles, to mix with it exoteric ideas, religious or philosophical, or, generally, to attach a strange doctrine to the Person of Jesus, however recognised in His Messianic, prophetic, or reforming character. The first heretical influences and forms belonging to the apostolic age passed from the Synagogue into the Church. As a Platonized Judaism had grown up in Egypt in the Alexandrian School, so, too, the numerous Jews scattered over Asia Minor, who were much less subject than their brethren in Palestine to the dominant Pharisaism which rejected all foreign elements, had derived from contact with Greek culture and

[1] Apoc. xx—xxii.

speculation a good deal which held out to their taste pretensions of a higher intellectual nourishment. With a desire to search out the secrets of the world of angels and demons was closely connected a longing for license and emancipation of the flesh, roused and cherished by the seductive influence of Heathen morality. Men of this temper of mind were all the more ready to join the young Christian communion, because they found in it a new association, midway between Judaism and Heathenism, and a doctrine not shut up in fixed forms, but both capable of development and requiring it—what seemed like a shell they could fill according to their own mind.

The difficulty of the apostles' work was essentially increased through the necessity of combating such attempts, whether the authors and adherents of these alien doctrines built upon maintaining their position within the apostolic communion, or laboured to effect a separation, and form rival ecclesiastical bodies. Paul says of these divisions in their first beginnings that, as in the divine order of the world evil is the unwilling instrument of good, so these separations and their courses are necessary in the higher dispensation of the Church, to prove and purify its members, and exclude those who are found wanting.[1] The apostle uses here the word, "Heresy," derived from the Greek philosophical schools, and it has passed from him into the language of the Church, to designate parties which separate themselves from the Church on account of doctrinal variations, or are excluded from it. But it was long

[1] 1 Cor. xi. 19.

before actual separations occurred. Paul speaks oftener of "weak brethren" of Israel;[1] Jewish prejudices sucked in in childhood were powerful with them; they were neither willing nor able to form parties or sects, but stood alone, and it was to be expected that in time under the influence of the new life of faith of their fellow Christians, especially Gentile converts, they would become completely identified with them. Paul treated such persons with tender and considerate forbearance. He says of them, "If in anything ye are otherwise minded, God shall reveal to you this also;" *i.e.* He will correct your views through the influence of the community, and your growth in the Spirit of Christ.[2]

But far more suspicious and threatening elements soon appeared in the newly founded communities. The wonted Judaism in its Pharisaic form, to which nothing was so dear as the universal force of the Law and the perpetual prerogatives of the Jewish nationality,—the Judaism Paul attacked so sharply—never succeeded in forming separate congregations, at least for any time, and in the later apostolic period this danger seems to have been no longer important. On the other hand, a doctrine of far more seductive tendency crept increasingly into the communities—a Gnostic Judaism,—producing serious disorders, and entailing on the apostles and their first successors a difficult contest. It is uncertain when, and under what influences, this Gnostic tendency and admixture of Jewish and Gentile teaching found entrance among the Jews of the dispersion. In Palestine it only

[1] Rom. xiv. 1, 2. 1 Cor. viii. 7; ix. 22. [2] Phil. iii. 15.

appeared among the Essenes, and there is no trace of their spreading or having influence out of Palestine. We can only say that the older Orphic Pythagorean ideas, and the notion long before brought into the West by the Babylonian magicians of various classes of demons, both higher and ministering spirits, and the conditions of their action, had gained admission also among the Jews of Asia Minor.[1]

The false teachers against whom Paul warned the believers of Colossæ were Jewish converts who held to the Law and circumcision, and required an observance of the Old Testament rules about meats, and the Jewish feasts, new moons and Sabbaths. To this they added, against the body, as the defiling prison of the soul, a violent and unmeasured asceticism, and an angel-worship founded, as the apostle says, on a false humility. They made the angels, according to the Heathen idea, mediators whom men must apply to because the supreme God was incomprehensible and out of reach.[2] Without doubt they thus degraded the dignity of Christ, as a Prophet to whom only one of these cosmic angels, and an angel of a lower order, had revealed himself, whence Paul here insists so emphatically on the majesty of the Only-Born. The apostle's warning, "Beware that none rob you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men," proves that this doctrine was drawn from a Heathen philosophy, as it was with the Essenes.[3]

The false teachers of Ephesus and its neighbourhood,

[1] Clem. Alex. *Strom.* iii. 6. [2] Theodoret *ad Coloss.* ii. 18.
[3] Col. ii. 8.

against whom the Pastoral Epistles of Paul are directed, were closely related to those of Colossæ. They were Jewish Gnostics; what they called *gnosis* was a pretended deeper and more secret insight into divine things, for which the mass of the uninitiated was unfit. They busied themselves with "myths and endless genealogies," *i. e.* with spinning out long catalogues of œons, whose limitation was purely arbitrary, and who might just as well have been multiplied. Paul calls the fables of these teachers and their fantastic stories about the spirit world "Jewish myths,"[1] which shows that they had not come immediately from Judaism, but through the medium of a Judaism enriched with Heathen speculations. Paul further foretells that to these errors will soon be added practical mistakes, the forbidding of marriage and of certain meats (namely, animal food,) from the essentially Gnostic view so foreign to Jewish traditions, that physical generation is something Satanic, and the use of sexual intercourse evil and defiling.[2] Two of these heretics, Hymenæus and Philetus, maintained that the resurrection was past already, meaning that it belonged to the present not to the future, and took place at the moment when man attained through *gnosis* to the consciousness of his higher, ante-natal existence, and true destiny.[3]

Another class of false teachers in Asia Minor, who threatened and partly laid waste the early Church, are mentioned in Peter's Second Epistle, and by Jude. The Gnostic idea seems to have been their predominant

[1] Tit. i. 14. [2] 1 Tim. iv. 3. [3] 2 Tim. ii. 18.

one, but connected with a shameless Antinomianism. They promised to conduct their followers to true freedom, appealing to Paul, whose teaching about Evangelical freedom and the abolition of the Law as a dead letter they twisted to their own ends. They added in mockery, that the promise of Christ's Second Coming was still unfulfilled, and there was no appearance of the world being destroyed, nay, rather that everything continued as it had been since the beginning of the creation. These false believers were in outward communion with the Church; for they took part in the *agapæ*, and profaned them for gratifying their animal desires.[1] But the Antichrists whose conduct John mentions in his first Epistle were separated, seemingly of their own will, from Church communion. They denied with the Gnostics the identity of Jesus and Christ, believed in no true Incarnation, and attributed to Jesus a merely apparent body, like the Docetæ.[2] John calls them Antichrists, because he makes the denial of the Incarnation the fundamental lie which constitutes a real Antichrist, for whoever denies the Son, owing to the Son's essential union with the Father, denies the Father or God in the truth of His Being.

Christian antiquity regards Simon Magus as the arch-heretic and father of all heresy. The magical powers by which he supported his claim to a divine office and mission probably consisted in his use of certain physical arts for adjuring spirits and demons, healing the sick, and playing magical tricks. In his

[1] 2 Pet. ii. 19; iii. 3, 4. Jude 12. [2] 1 John, ii. 19, 20; iv. 3.

native country of Samaria he had gained over all the people from the least to the greatest, and he was universally believed to be an emanation from the Godhead come among them in human person, and, indeed, the highest of all, called for pre-eminence "the great power of God."[1] Simon was undoubtedly a remarkable person; his conversion to Christianity was merely external and temporary, from a desire to partake in the extraordinary gifts of the apostles. His name is involved, chiefly by the older heretics, in a network of fables; what is certain is, that afterwards he came to Rome and there again fell in with Peter. The oldest received tradition about his end is, that after preaching under a plane-tree he had himself buried alive, giving out that he should rise again, but, as was natural, rose no more.[2] The document the Simonians had under his name, the "Great Apophasis," (or Annunciation) is certainly not his, and it is impossible, generally, to distinguish what belongs to the later development of the doctrine of their sect from the original dogmas of Simon himself.

The special severity of the author of the Apocalypse is directed against the Nicolaitan sect, whose works and life are characterized as hateful.[3] They gave out the deacon Nicolas of Jerusalem for their founder. There were two reports in the early Church about him and the occasion of connecting his name with the sect. He had a very beautiful wife, from whom he separated, in order to lead a life of continence. According to one

[1] Acts viii. 10.
[2] Hippol. *Philos.* p. 176, Miller.
[3] Apoc. ii. 6, 15.

report, he after awhile took back his wife, from uxoriousness, and at last maintained that daily payment of the marriage debt is necessary for salvation. The Nicolaitans seem really to have taught this.[1] Clement gives an entirely different account, and he had much better sources of information, for he knew that the deacon's son and daughter lived to be very old in constant celibacy.[2] According to this account, the apostles reproached the deacon with being too jealous about his wife, on which he sent for her and said thoughtlessly and in anger before the community, by way of getting rid of the reproach, that any one who would might marry her. And this was made a pretext of by men who wished to find a colour for their excesses, in connection with another saying of Nicolas, that one must maltreat one's flesh. Nicolas referred to taming the flesh by vigorous asceticism, but the heretics, who adorned themselves with his name, interpreted it of satisfying the lusts of the flesh by free indulgence. The Nicolaitans in Ephesus, Pergamos, and other cities of Asia Minor were, then, a Gnostic, Antinomian sect, who recommended acquiescence in Heathen idolatry, declared eating meats offered to the gods a thing indifferent after pronouncing an exorcism over them, had community of wives, and made peace with those who practised impurity after an eight days separation.[3]

The Balaamites, mentioned in the message to the

[1] Epiph. xxv. 1., p. 76.
[2] Clem. Alex. *Strom.* iii. p. 436.
[3] Iren. ii. 27; iii. 11. Theod. *Hær. Fab.* iii. 1.

Church of Pergamos, were different from the Nicolaitans; they are so named by the writer because they tempted Christians to Heathen licentiousness, as Balaam by his advice to Balak had tempted the Israelites. They also dispensed themselves from the apostolic prohibition to eat meat offered to idols, took part in Gentile sacrificial feasts, and suffered themselves to be thereby led into immorality. In Thyatira there were then adherents of a Gnostic prophetess whom the apostle calls Jezebel, and who taught similar errors.[1]

Of the four Gospels received by the Church, John composed the last; and thus at the end of the history of the apostles we are brought to the consideration of the historical literature emanating from them, consisting of five treatises. There were other narratives before the four we have, but nothing is now known of them, beyond what Luke says at the commencement of his Gospel, that many had already undertaken to compose a Life of Jesus, or to relate what they knew of the facts concerning Him, of which the members of the Church were firmly convinced.[2] These written records, therefore, reach back to the time when most of the apostles and many other eye-witnesses were still living, and when, therefore, any mistakes must at once have been set right.

But when apostles, and eminent disciples of apostles, undertook to narrate the life and teaching of Jesus, these earlier essays of unknown authors perished. The first to do this was Matthew, formerly a publican on the

[1] Apoc. ii. 20—24. [2] Luke i. 1, 2.

Sea of Gennesareth, and then an apostle. He wrote his Gospel in the Hebrew (*i.e.* Aramaic) language, primarily for the Christians of Palestine. This Aramaic original has long been lost; from the second century at least the Church knew and used only a Greek translation, the authorship of which was unknown even in ancient times; how far it gives an exact or a free rendering of the Aramaic text it is impossible to say. The quotations from the Old Testament frequently differ both from the Alexandrian version and the Hebrew text. The aim of the Evangelist is to show the Messianic dignity of Jesus, to convince the unbelieving Jews that the nation and its rulers had rejected and slain Him in manifest and judicial blindness, and to supply for the converted Jews an historical justification of their forming themselves into a distinct communion. He, therefore, presents the history of Jesus specially in connection with the Old Testament, and seizes every opportunity of pointing to His fulfilment of an Old Testament prophecy or type. Therefore, again, since he wrote for Jews who had still a vivid recollection of the facts, his narratives are much shorter, and the discourses more fully given; and in this careful account of long doctrinal discourses in their internal coherence he betrays his apostolical character. On the other hand, he is often less explicit than Mark and Luke in describing facts, and circumstances of time and place; he sometimes compresses the narrative portion into a few general statements; he groups together what is

similar, and follows rather the order of relation than of time.

This is certainly the oldest of the canonical Gospels, and therefore it served as a pattern for the two others. That Matthew wrote first, and wrote in Hebrew, is the tradition of the ancient Church, represented by a line of witnesses stretching back into apostolic times, and commencing with Papias, which was never questioned by any ancient authority. Irenæus adds, that he wrote when intending to leave Palestine, at the time of the common labours of Peter and Paul in Rome, *i.e.* between 63 and 67 A.D.[1] His Gospel was at all events composed before the destruction of Jerusalem.

John Mark, son of a Christian named Mary who lived at Jerusalem, and nephew of Barnabas, was converted by Peter, and acted as an assistant not only to Paul, but to Barnabas and Peter also; he was with Paul in his first imprisonment at Rome, and accompanied Peter as interpreter or secretary to write down what he dictated.[2] He wrote his Gospel in Rome, and for the Roman Church principally, under Peter's inspiration, that is, from notes taken down in conversation with him, and from hearing his discourses.[3] According to the oldest tradition, Peter neither hindered nor encouraged the publication

[1] Papias *ap. Eus.* iii. 39. Pantæn. *ap. Eus.* v. 10. Orig. *ap. Eus.* vi. 25. Euseb. iii. 24. Epiph. *Hor.* xxx. 3. Hieron. *Præf. in Matt.* Iren. iii. 1.

[2] Acts xii. 12. 1 Pet. v. 13. Col. iv. 10. Philem. 24.

[3] Papias *ap. Eus.* iii. 39. Tert. *c. Marc.* iv. 5. Iren. iii. 1. Eus. v. 8.

of the Gospel; according to the account preserved by Eusebius, he expressly confirmed it.[1] Irenæus, on the contrary, affirms that it was not made public till after the death of Peter and Paul.

Papias mentions this connection of Mark's Gospel with Peter on the authority of the Presbyter John, a disciple of the Lord, adding that Mark did not write things in the order of their occurrence, but in the order he heard them from Peter. Meanwhile, he made use of the Gospels of Matthew and Luke in his narrative, sometimes abbreviating, sometimes combining, sometimes expanding their statements, so that only six passages are peculiar to him.[2] What he learnt from Peter supplied him with his rule in the use of the other Gospels, and the choice to be made of their contents. He mostly gives only facts, passing over the long discourses and the birth and youth of Jesus, beginning with the appearance of the Baptist. His omission of all which chiefly concerned the Jews, and his explanation of Jewish customs and localities, prove that he wrote specially for Gentile Christians.

Whether the Greek physician, Luke, was a convert from the Gentiles, or from the Hellenistic Jews, is doubtful, but he shows an ample acquaintance with Jewish conditions and manners, and uses in the Acts the Jewish chronology. His Gospel transports us into

[1] Clem. Alex. *Hypot. ap. Eus.* vi. 14. Eus. ii. 15. *Dem. Evang.* iii. 5. Hieron. *ad Hedib.* cl. 11.

[2] Mark iv. 26—29; vii. 32—37; viii. 22—26; xi. 1—14; xiii. 35—37; xvi. 9—11.

the company of Paul, to whom he gave himself up with devoted loyalty; he attended him on his missionary journeys, and stuck to him during his imprisonment at Rome, whence he is specially praised by him.[1] Luke states that many before him had undertaken to write the Evangelical history, and that he had sought out everything from the beginning; he doubtless, therefore, examined and used the matter he found ready to his hand.[2] He wrote immediately for a Christian named Theophilus, probably a Roman of high rank, to show him the certainty of the instruction he had received. It is clear that Paul, or Paul's manner of teaching, had a certain influence over this Gospel in its method of composition and choice of matter, so that Irenæus says distinctly, that Luke wrote down the Gospel Paul preached.[3] The aspects of doctrine specially represented by Paul, as apostle of the Gentiles, are conspicuously brought forward in the parables and narratives of Luke,—the call of the Gentiles, the universal scope of Christianity, and the forgiveness assured to believing love and humility. No doubt was ever felt in the Church as to the authorship of this third Gospel, and the same may be said of Luke's second historical composition, the Acts of the Apostles, which is a continuation or second part of his Gospel. There is only a later and purely isolated notice of its being ascribed by some to Clement of Rome, and by others to Barnabas.[4] The "Acts," too, were com-

[1] 2 Tim. iv. 10, 11.
[2] Luke i. 1—3. [3] Iren. iii. 1.
[4] Phot. *Quæst. Amphil.* 145.

posed for Theophilus's instruction, the matter of the book being drawn from three sources, earlier narratives, information orally imparted by the apostles and other witnesses, and the author's personal testimony. In the latter portion of the book he frequently indicates, by saying "we," that he was an eye-witness, and took part in the events described.[1]

Widely different from the three older Gospels is the fourth and last, the work of the apostle "whom Jesus loved," who alone stood by His Cross, and to whom He entrusted His Mother. This Gospel was published in Ephesus about 97 A.D., having been composed by John in his extreme old age, during or soon after his banishment to Patmos. It was written at the urgent entreaty of the Bishops of the Asiatic coast, and of deputies sent from several Churches, and many still surviving disciples of Christ, among whom is said to have been the apostle Andrew. There is a very old tradition reaching back to the time of Polycarp, John's disciple, that John bade those who urged him to compose a new Gospel, observe a three days' fast with him, that God might reveal His will to them. On this, it was revealed to the apostle Andrew, that John should write down every thing in his own name, and the rest examine it.[2] The apostle had a double aim in composing his Gospel, both to supplement the narratives of the older Gospels,

[1] Acts xvi. 10—17; xx. 5—15; xxi. 1—18; xxvii. 1—38.

[2] *Canon Murat.* Jerome relates in substance the same tradition (*Præf. Comm. in Matt.*) appealing to the *Ecclesiastica Historia*, which contains it, and putting forward the Prologue to the Gospel as a special result of the revelation then made to John.

and to oppose the Jewish Gnosticism introduced by Cerinthus, which was trying even to establish itself in Ephesus, and especially its teaching about the Person of Christ.[1] This is done, without any direct controversy or specific mention of the heresy, by a simple statement of the opposite facts. It is also an old tradition that John desired to write a spiritual Gospel, and as the other three Evangelists had mainly treated the bodily, the outward acts of Christ, so he wished to give special prominence to the spiritual element.[2]

The old tradition, that John meant to supplement the three other Gospels, is confirmed by comparing them with his. He generally pre-supposes their narratives and supplies omissions, nor is his own account intelligible without reference to the earlier Gospels. He only repeats three of the same events the three other Evangelists give, besides the history of the Passion, viz., the feeding of the five thousand, Jesus walking on the sea, and Mary anointing Him.[3] He purposely omits the most important things, the Birth of Jesus, the Baptism, Temptation, Transfiguration, and institution of the Eucharist (though he relates the washing of the disciples' feet which immediately preceded it), and the Agony in Gethsemane. Even in describing the Passion he passes over what was already known from the other Evangelists,

[1] Eus. vi. 14. [2] Clem. Alex. *ap. Eus.* vi. 14.

[3] [This assumes the cleansing of the temple in St. John to be a different event from that in the Synoptics. Cf. supr. p. 49, note. Mary's anointing at Bethany is mentioned by St. Matthew and St. Mark; the event recorded by St. Luke (Luke vii. 37, 38) is clearly a different one.—Tr.]

where it is not rendered necessary by the context, or for the sake of making some addition to it; he makes his narrative dovetail into the others, omitting what they say, and giving what they omit. Once, he expressly corrects the chronology of the older Gospels.[1] He excels the other Evangelists in accuracy of dates, and greater freshness and more life-like method of description, repeatedly testifying to the truth of his narrative as being an eye-witness and ear-witness of what he tells.[2] Notwithstanding the limitations imposed on his choice of matter by his special objects, the order of narration is almost dramatic; the history marches on in sequence of time, and one sees the enmity of the Jews advancing to its final development in the closing catastrophe. The Gospel is a connected harmonious whole, in which clearness and depth, simplicity of expression and lofty elevation of thought, are united in equal measures. Above all, the enthusiastic love of the writer for Him on whose heart he rested shines throughout; he knows how to interweave the very nicest shades of character into his portrait of his Lord. But the teachings of Jesus are with him the great thing; the acts he relates are often only a preface to a discourse of the Lord, and thus he only recounts five of His miracles. It is only for the sake of the introductory discourse of Jesus that he repeats His multiplication of the loaves, and walking on the sea, from the other Evangelists.

The scene of the history and most of its contents are different from those in the other Evangelists. Mat-

[1] John iii. 24. [2] John i. 14; xix. 35.

thew, the Galilean publican of Capernaum, and Mark and Luke, who follow him, relate the works of Jesus among the fishermen, shepherds, and little towns of Galilee, after the Baptist's imprisonment. Here John comes in to supply what occurred between the Temptation of Jesus and the Baptist's apprehension, especially His first public appearance in Judæa.[1] His journeys to Jerusalem at the festivals were intimated and implied, but not described, in the earlier Gospels, no doubt because Matthew was hindered by his business from attending them. Luke, however, has given copious notices of the acts and teaching of Jesus in two journeys through Samaria towards Jerusalem, during which His ministry extended beyond the borders of Galilee; but he breaks off at the entrance of the Lord into the capital.[2] John, on the other hand, who never left Him, relates each journey to Jerusalem and what took place there, the acts and teaching of Jesus in Judæa, and especially in the holy city. Hence, too, the great difference of form between the teaching and discourses of Jesus in the older Gospels and in this. The former relate principally addresses adapted for the Galilean populace in gnomes, parables, and moral precepts, while John gives rather what Jesus said in the capital, conversing with rulers, priests, and men learned in the law; he narrates whole conversations and discourses, interrupted by objections and contradictions. The words of Jesus in this Gospel are often more solemn, mysterious, and hard to understand—undoubtedly because it is precisely

[1] John i.—iv. [2] Luke ix. 51 sqq; xix. 28 sqq.

such utterances of his Lord that were most deeply engraven on him from his temperament of mind, and because it was part of his object to exhibit the Messiah as the divine incarnate Logos, and, therefore, to bring forward those sayings of Jesus which point, in opposition to the unbelief of the Jews, to His divine dignity and heavenly origin.

The author of the fourth Gospel indicates without naming himself so unmistakably, that even apart from tradition there could be no doubt about him. He only describes himself in the narrative as "the disciple whom Jesus loved," or the "other disciple." He wrote, as he says, "that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God," not for Jews or unconverted Gentiles, but for Gentile and Hellenistic Jewish converts. His first Epistle seems to be an accompaniment to his Gospel. When he says at the beginning of this Epistle, "What we have heard, and have seen with our eyes, and our hands have handled of the Word of Life . . . . that we preach unto you," and when again he uses the words, "I write unto you," of what he had written previously, this must refer to his Gospel.[1] Above all, the Epistle is most closely allied in spirit and tone with the Gospel. There is abundant proof of the Gospel being the work of John, from the whole tradition of the Church, and the influence it had from the first on the teaching, habits of thought, and writings of Christians. "It is well known," says Eusebius, "to all the Churches under heaven, and the first line is conclusive evidence to every one."[2]

[1] 1 John ii. 12—14. [2] Eus. iii. 24.

Were it, as recent writers have tried to make out, a supposititious work of the middle of the second century, it must at once, as though by miracle, have come into universal use and veneration, at a time when other spurious Gospels were carefully rejected by the Christians. It would be inconceivable how the Churches of Asia Minor, over which John presided to the last, could have at once received it, and none of his many disciples raised a voice against it.

There are other Gospels on record besides these, among which the "Gospel of the Hebrews," in the Syro-Chaldaic language, was the oldest and most important, founded on the Aramaic original of Matthew. It existed in two forms, for both the Jewish Christian sects, Nazarites and Ebionites, possessed it, but each with special additions. Both parties, of course, maintained that their Gospel was the genuine production of Matthew, and the Ebionite, Symmachus, at the end of the second century, attacked the Greek version in his memoirs, naturally, as he assumed the Ebionite form to be the true one.[1] The Nazarites, who were nearer the Church, had it in its complete form, with the two first chapters, which are missing in the Ebionite Gospel.[2] It was probably known in this form to the Jewish Christian, Hegesippus, who occasionally quoted it.[3] Jerome was allowed by the Nazarites of Berœa to copy it, and he translated it into Greek and Latin. He shared the prevalent opinion that it was in substance the original writing of Matthew, but

[1] Eus. vi. 17. [2] Epiph. *Hær.* xxix. 9.
[3] Eus. iv. 22; iii. 20. Phot. *Bibl. Cod.* 232.

in a mutilated condition.[1] The Gospel was not, as has been recently maintained,[2] a corrupt translation from the Greek of Matthew, for, according to Jerome, all the Old Testament passages were quoted from the Hebrew text, not the Alexandrian version, and that Father, who knew well enough what he had twice translated, would easily have discovered its alleged Greek origin. But he always retained his belief that it came from the Hebrew of Matthew, the version which the apostle Bartholomew brought to South Arabia or Ethiopia, and Pantœnus found there a century later.[3]

Those of whose apostolic labours history tells us are the "pillars of the Church," Peter, James, Alphæus, John, and after them Paul and Barnabas; of the work of the other eight apostles the New Testament contains no trace, and later authorities supply only scanty and in part uncertain notices. Several of them are said to

[1] Hier. *de Vir. Ill.* iii. *adv. Pelag.* iii. 1.

[2] Delitzsch *Zeitschrift für Luth. Theologie* 1850, p. 469.

[3] Jerome did not know two documents, an Aramaic Gospel of Matthew and a Nazarite Hebrew Gospel, but one document only, which the Nazarites lent him and which he transcribed and translated, of which there was also a copy in the Pamphylian library at Cæsarea. Of this he once says, that it is the original of Matthew, elsewhere that it was taken for such by many. He calls it the "Gospel the Nazarites use" (*ad Matt.* xii. 13; xxiii. 35, *Comm. in Ezech.* xxiv. 7) or "that written in Hebrew characters," (*Ep. ad Hedib.*) Thus the Nazarite Gospel of the Hebrews agreed for the most part with the Greek text of Matthew, except as regards the passages and additions marked by him; and he could both say that the Nazarite document *was* the Hebrew of Matthew (*i.e.* in substance), and that many so regarded it—those, namely, who knew only of the substantial agreement and not of the variations and interpolations. Jerome had no further knowledge of the Ebionite Gospel of the Hebrews, as neither had Epiphanius of the Nazarite (at least any more accurate, knowledge).

have visited distant lands as preachers of Christ, and, so far as Jewish communities in such regions gave them a centre and stand-point, this is credible. Origen says that Andrew worked in Scythia, and Thomas in Parthia, viz., the Western districts of the Parthian Kingdom between the Euphrates and Tigris.[1] There, in Edessa, was his sepulchre, and the graves of four apostles only, Peter, Paul, John, and Thomas were known in the fourth century.[2] Bartholomew went to "India"—which probably means Southern Arabia—and there, a century later, Pantænus found the Aramaic Gospel of Matthew, which he had brought.[3] All that is told of Matthew in the oldest authorities is, that he lived in strict continence, and ate no flesh.[4] Philip taught in Phrygia and died in Hierapolis. His three daughters, some married, some unmarried, were highly reverenced long after his death, and Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, in the second century speaks of them as venerated pillars of the Church of Asia.[5] Of Matthias there is only a saying preserved on the necessity of taming the flesh thoroughly by mortification.[6] Heracleon in the middle of the second century maintained that Matthias, Thomas, Philip, and Matthew died a natural death, and Clement quotes this without contradicting it.[7] Lastly, Barnabas, immediately called by Christ to the apostolate like Paul, placed by Luke and the Apostolic Council before Paul,

[1] Orig. *ap. Eus.* iii. 1.
[2] Chrys. *Hom. in Heb.* xxvi.
[3] Eus. v. 10.
[4] Clem. Alex. *Pæd.* ii. 1, p. 114.
[5] Polyc. *ap. Eus.* v. 24.
[6] Clem. Alex. *Strom.* iii. p. 436.
[7] Clem. Alex. *Strom.* i. 4. p. 502. For Ματθαῖος we must read Ματθίας, for the Levi named afterwards is Matthew.

and rightly reckoned by Jerome the fourteenth apostle, with Paul as thirteenth, seems to have died in Cyprus. The Epistle to the Jewish Christians extant under his name and much read in the ancient Church is shown by clear grounds of internal evidence not to be his, but was ascribed to him later; no doubt, through mere conjecture, and with no intent to deceive. It was obviously written after the destruction of Jerusalem, at a time when an attempt was made to restore the Jewish temple, which can only have been in the period between Nerva and the second destruction under Hadrian, from 97 to 135 A.D.[1] The harshness of judgment on everything Jewish, the unmeasured exaggeration in describing the moral character of the apostles before their call, the number of forced typical and allegorical meanings, the unhistorical and unscriptural views, *e.g.*, about circumcision—all these things are fatal to the notion of a Levite and apostle being author of this Epistle. It is obviously the work of an unknown Alexandrian allegorist in the first half of the second century. That the name of Barnabas was given to it, occurred naturally from the learned allegorical explanation of the ceremonial law, combined with the anti-Jewish scope of the Epistle, suggesting a man who was both a Levite and an apostle of the Gentiles as the writer. Yet Eusebius classed the document as a spurious production with other decidedly apocryphal writings.[2]

Mark planted the Christian Church at Alexandria, and, according to Eusebius, made Annianus first bishop

[1] Ep. Barn. c. 16.

[2] Eus. iii. 25.

there, A.D. 62.[1] For centuries his mantle was preserved, and every new bishop clothed with it at his enthronement, and in the fourth century pilgrims came from a distance to visit his tomb near the city.[2] Titus, whom Paul had finally sent to Dalmatia, returned to Crete, and died there.[3] Thaddæus or Adæus, a Jew of Edessa and one of the seventy disciples, was sent by the apostle Thomas to his native city, where he converted King Abgar of Osroene, with some of his people. Eusebius found a report of this in the Archives of Edessa,[4] which may thus claim to be the first of all cities that became completely Christian, and the centre whence Christianity was propagated in the Persian kingdom.

[1] Eus. ii. 16.

[2] Literat. Brev. c. 20. Pullad. *Hist. Laus.* c. 113.

[3] *Addita. Gr. ad Hieron. de Vir. Ill.* 12.

[4] Eus. i. 13. Cf. Asseman. *Bibl. Orient.* iii. P. ii. p. 3 sqq. *Acta. S. Thom. ill. Thilo.* p. 116.

SECOND BOOK.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE APOSTLES.

CHAPTER I.

SCRIPTURE AND TRADITION.

It was inconsistent with the origin and dignity of the Founder of the Christian Religion to write Himself. He was too exalted to become a writer. It was not by a book, but by His acts, His words, the means of grace He ordained, and the Spirit whom He bestowed, that He chose to found His Church. Nor did He give His disciples a commission to write. They were to go from place to place bearing witness everywhere personally by word of mouth, and claiming to be heard, and so to carry His message and form communities. When He promised them the assistance of the Holy Ghost, He was not thinking of authorship, but of the cases where they would have to speak. And even in that solemn moment of departure, when He gave His last charges including all their apostolic duties, there was no mention

made of writing books. So, again, was it when Paul was called to the apostolate. And among the *charismata* he reckons a prophetic gift, but no special gift of writing.[1]

Several apostles, James, son of Zebedee, Philip, Thomas, Simon, and Matthias, have left no writings. A quarter of a century passed from the Ascension before anything was written at all. And those who then began to write were led to do so from immediate circumstances, and had no idea of leaving behind them religious documents or full confessions of faith,—books like those of Moses and the Prophets, or the original records of other religions, which claim to be divinely inspired codes of doctrine and practice. None of the apostles held it necessary to collect and put on record in one or more written documents a summary of his oral teaching, nor have any done so; still less could there be any design of the writings of separate apostles being made to supplement each other, and combined into a general statement of Christian doctrine. That could not be attempted, because there was no such thing with the apostles as a previous arrangement and distribution of labour in their writings. Every one wrote as the particular occasion required, to supply the want of personal intercourse, to confirm what had been taught already by word of mouth, to answer questions, resolve doubts, denounce errors and evil customs, in short to do the very thing which was best and oftenest done by word of mouth. Paul attached greater weight to his oral

[1] Rom. xii. 6. 1 Cor. xii. 10.

teaching, to sight and speech, than to his writings. While he addressed to the Roman Christians his most elaborate and dogmatic Epistle, he yet desired to see them, that from the fulness of his spirit he might impart some gift of grace to confirm their faith.[1] He wrote to the Thessalonians, that he prayed without ceasing to see them again, to supply the defects of their faith.[2] In all the apostolic Epistles a previous knowledge of the matter of faith is implied. "I have not written to you as though you knew not the truth," says John.[3] The apostles only meant to recall what had been orally taught, and the contents of their Epistles are chiefly practical. Moral exhortations, precepts and counsels about conduct in relations of life partly or wholly exceptional and of new occurrence, and censures of imminent or actual abuses and vices, constitute a great part of the matter.

If we examine the doctrinal drift of the apostolic speeches and letters, we shall find the leading ideas of Peter to be the Messianic office of Christ, the atoning and purifying power of His sufferings and death, His influence in the world unseen, and the three conditions of hope and future blessedness, repentance, faith, and baptism, together finally with the Second Coming of the Lord and renewal of the world. These are asserted briefly and authoritatively by him. The fundamental idea in James' Epistle is, that the law is elevated and transfigured into a law of liberty; for the rest, he only interweaves into his moral exhortations and censures the doctrine that it is not faith alone, but faith with

[1] Rom. i. 11 sqq. [2] 1 Thess. iii. 10. [3] 1 John ii. 21.

works, that justifies men before God. In the writings of John it is the Divine Word, the Only Born Son, who is Life and the Principle of life for all mankind, and who shows Himself the Deliverer from the power and defilement of sin through the threefold means and testimony of His blood, or death, the water (of baptism), and the Holy Ghost whom He bestows. The life He gives is above all the love of God, and with and through it the taking away of sin, the capacity of santification, the power to know God and keep His commandments, the confidence that our prayers are heard, and the sure and joyful hope of ultimate salvation.

Paul, as is natural, deals most largely in doctrine, partly grounded on an elaborate argumentation from passages of the Old Testament. At the same time, a great portion of his Epistles is occupied with hortatory matter. The whole of the Philippians is an out-pouring of heart in thankfulness and love, without any doctrinal significance. A good deal of his writing is only a defence of his office, and his conduct towards the Gentiles; thus the whole Second Epistle to the Corinthians is devoted to maintaining his apostolical authority against various attacks. Then, again, practical questions of Christian life and discipline chiefly occupy him in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, such as parties among Christians, the use of spiritual gifts, meat offered in sacrifice, immorality, marriage, the *agape*, women covering their heads. The Epistles to Timothy and Titus give advice about the pastoral and teaching offices; those to the Romans, Colossians, Galatians, and Ephesians are

mostly doctrinal. His chief Epistle, that to the Romans, lays down that the righteousness without which, owing to the common sinfulness, none can be saved, is vainly sought in observance of the Mosaic law, but given by Christ through faith as a gift of grace. The Epistle to the Galatians, again, is to prove against the Jewish righteousness by works, that the law was indeed to conduct us to Christ, but that salvation is independent of its observance. In the Epistle to the Colossians, he speaks briefly of two truths of faith, the divinity of Christ, and redemption; in that to the Ephesians, of Church privileges and the happiness of belonging to Church communion. The Epistles to the Thessalonians contain, with much personal and hortatory matter, reference to the expectation of Christ's Second Coming and the resurrection. Lastly, the Epistle to the Hebrews, the most doctrinal after the Romans, exhibits in an argument designed entirely for the Jews of that day, the infinite dignity of Christ's Person, the consequent superiority of the Christian to the Old Testament religion, and the distinction of priesthood and sacrifice under the Old and the New Law.

All this, in general and in detail, is widely different from a code of doctrine, or summary of faith. The very fundamental doctrine of Christianity, so strange and offensive to Jews of that day, so new to Gentiles —that of the Holy Trinity—the doctrine the Church was to be engaged for centuries in fixing and building up, is nowhere affirmed in detail, scarcely touched on in passing, only always assumed. Yet with-

out this dogma, the whole fabric of Christianity which rested on it was insecure; every believer had to realize it as a fact, and to recognize and find the working out of his own salvation in the manifestation of the Father through His Incarnate Son, and the action of the Son through the Holy Ghost, though Christians of that day were far from seeking to master the mystery in the form of any abstract theory or speculation.

Whatever common attributes belong to the apostolic writings, the mental individuality and character of the writer always shows itself conspicuously. They are as unlike as possible to mere lifeless, impersonal instruments. Thus there is a striking contrast between John and Paul. John writes with calm assertion, without dialectical argument, his spiritual gaze fixed on God and the Incarnate Word, while the hurried movement of Paul's utterance, with its abrupt and pregnant statements, gives one the impression of his being often overpowered by the fulness of thoughts that crowded upon him. His many digressions, questions, exclamations, unfinished or half-finished sayings, anacolutha, parentheses—all this betrays a fiery impulse of mind, a deep emotion, and an anxiety to convince or terrify, which even his rich command of language sometimes fails to satisfy; and logical argument passes with a sudden turn into a lyrical cry of joy, or a solemn ecclesiastical doxology.

Everything had conspired to make the Greek language, that master-piece of human speech,—and at its highest point of development, as the creation of a literature unrivalled for richness and mental power in the ancient

world,—to make that queen of languages the first instrument for receiving Christian ideas, and giving them form and colour. The idiom the apostles wrote in was not, indeed, the language of Plato and Xenophon, with its Attic grace and refinement; it was the so-called "common speech," which arose after Alexander out of the dissolution and fusion of the old dialects, and in its Hellenistic form, that is, as the Jews of the period scattered over the Heathen world had learnt it from the mouth of the people, and adapted it for oral use, with a mixture of old Hebraisms and new Aramaic forms. It was, therefore, more like a provincial dialect than the language of books. But the widely-spread Alexandrian version of the Old Testament, with its strongly marked Hebraist character, had made this dialect into a vehicle for literature. Its vocabulary supplied the foundation of the apostolic and early Christian writings. They could adopt the Septuagint use of certain Greek words, to express such notions as faith, righteousness, repentance, sanctification, and others, strange as the words would sound to one versed in Greek and Roman literature. But this previous terminology could not suffice; the richness, depth, and speciality of Christian ideas constrained them to form a new one, not so much by coining new words, as by giving a new sense to old ones. If we find the word that in classical literature means "gracefulness" (χάρις) used by the apostles in the sense, wholly new to the Heathen, of divine grace, we may infer the distance, or rather gulf, between classical Greek and the language as made subservient to Chris-

tian purposes, and penetrated with the light of the Christian spirit. The notions either newly introduced into the then world, or revolutionized, corrected, and transfigured by Christianity—holiness as a divine operation in man, humility, conscience, the world, the distinction of soul and spirit—these, and many more, had to be clothed in a suitable Greek dress. We can only approximately conceive the impression made on educated Heathen of that and the following age by reading the apostolic writings. It must certainly in most cases have repelled them, if only from the speech and terminology; and much would be simply unintelligible to them.

The Old Testament passed from the Jewish into the Christian Church as a sacred document, henceforth her's of right, which bore witness to Christ and His Church, and which both had been fulfilled and would be further fulfilled through Him, and the institution He founded. Jesus had appealed in His own defence to the Old Testament books. "The Scriptures, in which ye think ye have eternal life, are they which testify of Me." "Moses wrote of Me."[1] He reproached the Jews with not knowing the Scriptures, and not being ready to believe them. He had come into the world to fulfil the indivisible whole of the Old Testament, the Law and the Prophets. He did not mean to abolish it; on the contrary, His whole life, His teaching, the founding of His Church, His sacrificial death, and His resurrection, were to be a fulfilling of the Law, and the promises; and this

[1] John v. 39, 46.

was to continue through the whole period of His Church, till its final accomplishment. He derived from Judaism the whole doctrinal and ethical substratum of His Church. Only those exclusively national limitations which were inconsistent with the universality of the Church, and the ritual shadows which were abrogated by fulfilment, and whose place was supplied by realities, were to cease; Christianity was to become the development and spiritual fulfilment of Judaism for all mankind. In this sense, He could say that not any, the least, iota of the Law should pass away, while heaven and earth remained.[1]

The early Church received from the Synagogue the collection of Jewish sacred books in their then threefold division, Law, Prophets, and Hagiographa (*Ketubim*), which name, however, came later into use. This collection of sacred writings was by no means closed at the time of Christ; there were different views about some parts of the Hagiographa; even long after the destruction of Jerusalem there was much dispute among the Jews about the value of the so-called three books of Solomon, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Canticles, and about receiving the book of Esther into the Canon. The school of Shammai wished to exclude Ecclesiastes from the Canon, and the new Synagogue founded at Jamnia after the Jewish war had an examination of witnesses about the extent of the third part of the Hebrew Canon.[2] The Alexandrian and Hellenistic Jews had in

[1] Matt. v. 18. Luke xvi. 17.

[2] Grätz. *Geschichte der Juden*, iv. p. 41 sqq.

their collection of sacred writings the books written or preserved only in Greek, whose origin dates from the four centuries between Malachi and John the Baptist, and these, as being incorporated in the Alexandrian version, passed with the rest into the use of the Christian Church. These books—Sirach (*i.e.* Ecclesiasticus), Wisdom, Tobias, Judith, Maccabees, and Baruch[1]—filled up the gaps, in a doctrinal and historical sense, left between the Captivity and the Roman dominion in the Hebrew collection; they were partly the result of the marriage of the Jewish and Greek mind, and the contact of Mosaicism with Greek philosophy, and thus acted as connecting links to prepare and pioneer the way for Christianity, and, if not quoted by name in the apostolic writings, they are often used word for word. The Old Testament writings, generally, are quoted in the New Testament under the common designation of the "Law and the Prophets."[2]

Christ and the apostles moved in the spritual atmosphere of these books, which required a thousand years for their gradual formation; from them the first Christians derived the tradition, that the Lord and His Church were the fulfilment and proper continuation of the old promises and old Covenant. Jesus had admitted to the Pharisees, that "the Scripture cannot be broken." Paul says, "All that was written before (our time) was

[1] [These books, with the Greek portions of Daniel and Esther, and the third and fourth of Esdras and Prayer of Manasses—which last three are rejected from the Tridentine Canon also—make up the Anglican Apocrypha.—Tr.]

[2] Luke xvi. 29, 31. Acts xxiv. 14.

written for our learning (viz. the Old Testament), that we through patience and consolation of the Scriptures may hold fast the hope" (of future salvation).[1] In the New Testament, besides Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, and the Pentateuch, the Psalms are quoted with particular frequency; most of the other Prophets, Job, and Proverbs are used. But Obadiah, Nahum, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Esther, Ezra, and Nehemiah, are never quoted. These Old Testament citations or appeals and arguments are not strictly a deduction and demonstration of particular doctrines from that source; as a rule, they only show that what was now a Christian certainty had been already attested there, or might be found in kindred and corresponding forms of expression. Christ Himself had not formed His teaching from these books, but possessed and proclaimed it from a higher original source, from His own immediate vision of God. The apostles and disciples did not use and expound the Old Testament according to any fixed hermeneutic system they had received or had themselves formed; they were convinced that in their knowledge of Christ and His history they had a key to the Biblical promises, that much hitherto obscure in these books had become clear to them by their faith, and that the then existing gift of prophecy was certainly in part to be applied to the interpretation of Scripture prophecies. They kept free from the tricksy and purely arbitrary exegetical devices already prevalent in the Rabbinical schools, though their method of interpretation was inherited in many

[1] John x. 35. Rom. xv. 4.

respects from the Jews. Starting from the consideration of the Bible as a great prophetical whole they saw everywhere types and promises of Christ, of His present kingdom, and its future glory; and the Old Testament was to them an inexhaustible mine of types, of historical parallels and applications. Looking back from the time of fulfilment to the preparatory period of Judaism they regarded persons, events, institutions, sayings, in the light of the world-wide dispensation of God, ordering and harmonizing all things, and thus in the present they recognised antitypes corresponding to those types of the past; they read all as a prophecy and shadow of the future, and were so much the more confident in the ultimate victory of their cause.

A more precise exposition of the relations of the Scriptural books to that divine guidance to which they owed their typical and prophetical character, or of the nature of their authors' illumination, will be sought in vain from Christ and the apostles. Taking the Pharisees' stand-point, while appealing to a word in the Psalms to justify an expression He had used, Christ says, 'the Scripture cannot be loosed, according to the belief of His opponents themselves, therefore it must also in this passage be right. What the Lord says of the abiding force of the Law, until every letter be fulfilled, applies simply to the future fulfilment of the old Law in Him and His Church.[1] There is no reference meant to the legal code, or the whole collection of Scriptural books.[2] Paul refers Timothy to the (Jewish)

[1] John x. 35. [2] Matt. v. 18. Luke xvi. 17.

sacred writings which he had known from childhood, and which (through faith rooted in Christ) could lead him to salvation; and adds, in a general way, without reference to any particular documents, that every Scripture, breathed through or inspired by God, is useful for instruction, correction, and improvement.[1] And lastly, Peter's observation, that the prophetic promises did not come of man's will, but that the Prophets spoke, being moved by the Holy Ghost, is confined to the Prophecies.[2] At the same time, the apostles often quote the Old Testament with the formula, "God," or "the Holy Ghost, says." And Paul recognises a divine, prophetic application in many passages or facts of the Old Testament, written for the requirements of Christians.[3]

The apostles generally availed themselves of the Alexandrian version of the Old Testament, already widely spread among the Jews, and used even in Palestine.[4] This version differs constantly, and in matters of importance, from the Hebrew text, or at least from the form given to it several centuries later by the Jewish "Masoreth." The text on which the Greek version was founded had no vowel points, accents, directions for reading, or division of words. For the whole present arrangement of the Hebrew text, the vocalisation, division of words, verses, and paragraphs, is the product

[1] 2 Tim. iii. 15, 16.

[2] 2 Pet. i. 21.

[3] Rom. iv. 23, 24; xv. 4. 1 Cor. ix. 10; x. 11.

[4] Of about 350 O. T. quotations in the N. T. only about 50 differ from the Septuagint. Cf. Grinfield's *Apology for the Septuagint.* (London, 1850), p. 145.

of the labours of much later Jewish schools many centuries after the introduction of Christianity. And thus the Greek translators, having to deal with a dead language, only understood by the learned, were left in numberless cases to their own judgment, or referred to the tradition of their own circle.[1] They laboured, too, in a period and situation standing in complete contrast to the earlier needs and circumstances of Israel, first for the Jewish dispersion outside Palestine, then for the Gentiles. They wished above all not to leave a mere literal translation, giving word for word;—the profound and fundamental distinction of the two languages forbade that. They frequently softened the harshnesses of the original, which contradicted later habits of thought, especially the anthropomorphisms; they exchanged figurative for ordinary language, and intercalated explanatory passages into the text. The Septuagint thus formed is the creation and monument of the first interpenetration of the Hebrew and Greek spirit, which took place at Alexandria. It was, together with the Alexandrian school whose views are mirrored in it, an instrument in the hands of Providence for setting free the Jewish spirit from its narrow, national exclusiveness, and pioneering the way for Judaism to pass into a world-religion, accomplished in Christianity. This school

[1] The reading of the unpunctuated text was not left to individual caprice, or entirely uncertain; there was a traditional interpretation; still that must have left much doubtful, and the Alexandrian translators cannot have always known it, and in other cases would reject its principles.

desired to intimate that in the history, laws, worship, and faith of Judaism was contained the kernel of an universal, divine truth, and pure philosophy, exalted above all national religions, and common to all peoples. It had a decided influence on the mental culture and manner of expression of the first preachers of the Gospel, as appears with Paul, and John, and above all, in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

In the use made by New Testament writers of Old Testament passages they display a freedom which cannot be measured by the rule of strict exegetical argument. They generally quote by the sense and not by the letter, according to the use they want to make of the passage. They combine several, sometimes widely separated passages into one,[1] or make a compound of different passages,[2] or quote so freely as to explain and adapt the passage to the event specified as its fulfilment.[3] Paul uses the greatest freedom of any; he commonly quoted simply after his own view of the sense, as the many departures from the text, greater or less, prove; he sometimes used the Alexandrian version, sometimes translated himself, where the Hebrew was fresher in his recollection, or served his purpose better. He often gets more out of a passage than the words or historical sense convey,[4] or ascribes to it a typical and symbolic meaning;[5] once he gives and applies to his

[1] e.g. Matt. xxi. 5. Acts xiii. 22.
[2] e.g. Rom. ix. 33. Cf. Is. xxviii. 16; viii. 14.
[3] Matt. xxvii. 9.
[4] Gal. iii. 8. Rom. iv. 11—13; ix. 25 sqq.
[5] 1 Cor. ix. 9.

argument a meaning precisely opposite to that of the passage quoted.[1] He not seldom adopts scriptural language to express his own ideas, and thus allows himself to make additions or changes, or applies the words in a new relation. It must be ascribed to the Greek translator, that in Matthew's Gospel, originally written in Aramaic, all the passages from the Pentateuch and Psalms, and some from the Prophets, follow the Septuagint text. Only some Messianic passages of the Prophets, where the Messianic reference of the Hebrew text was lost in the Greek translation, are quoted independently of the Alexandrian version. The author of the Hebrews goes furthest; he not only adheres so closely to the Alexandrian version that he seems to have had the text before him, but he founds his argument upon it in passages where it completely departs from the Hebrew text,[2] or makes additions to it.[3]

Nor can it be said that the apostles kept strictly to the canonical books of the Old Testament, using older texts. Jesus Himself quoted from writings now lost, and not comprised in the Canon;—thus He spoke of the fountains of living waters which shall flow from the believer, adding, "the Scripture saith," and the

[1] Eph. iv. 8, for "Thou receivedst gifts among men." Paul reads, "He gave gifts to men."

[2] In Heb. x. 5—7, for the Hebrew, "Mine ears hast Thou opened;" the Greek reads, "A body Thou hast prepared me." Jerome says this was made an objection to the Pauline authorship of the Epistle.—*Ad. Is.* vi. 9, *Opp. Ed. Mart.* iii. 64.

[3] Ib.

"Wisdom of God," from which He applied to Himself the passage about the Prophets sent to the Jews, and their fate, must be a book not found in the Canon.[1] So Paul, with the same formula he uses of canonical citations, "as it is written," adopts from another lost document, the "Revelation of Elias," the words, "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, nor hath it entered into man's heart, what God hath prepared for them that love Him." Again, in the Ephesians, a passage from some lost religious document is quoted with the usual formula.[2] Thus, again, James in his Epistle appeals to an expression which occurs nowhere in the Bible, with "the Scripture saith." And Jude in one short composition quotes two books not in the Canon, the Anabasis of Moses and the Book of Enoch.[3]

There is no trace of a collection of apostolic writings, or the formation of a New Testament Canon, being attempted in the apostolic age by John or any other influential Christian. We do not possess all that the apostles wrote; two Epistles of Paul, one to the Corinthians, one to the Laodiceans, had already in the early Church been lost.[4] Nor do we hear of any steps taken by the apostles or their immediate successors to provide

[1] John vii. 38. Luke xi. 49—51.

[2] 1 Cor. ii. 9. Eph. v. 14. The first is not taken from Is. lxiv. 4, as Jerome thinks (*ad Pamm.* Ep. 101), for except in the chance coincidence of two words there is no similarity in the passages [?]. Origen says, it stood in the book named above; *Comm. in Matt.* xxvii. 9, Cf. *Coteler. ad Const. Apost.* p. 346.

[3] James iv. 5. Jude 9, 14.

[4] 1 Cor. v. 9. Col. iv. 16.

all Churches with accurate copies of apostolic writings. Only once in the whole New Testament is mention made of the doctrine and writings of another apostle, when Peter reminds the Christians of Asia Minor that his "beloved brother," Paul, has given them similar advice, to lead a holy life, waiting for the appearance of the Lord; but he adds the warning that Paul's Epistles contain matter hard to understand, and already perverted by ignorant and unstable persons, as also they twisted to their own destruction "the other Scriptures," *i.e.*, those then used in the Christian communities.[1] It was thus openly admitted even in the apostolic age that important doctrinal passages of Paul's Epistles were hard to understand; and especially to Gentile Christians much in his writings must have continued to be difficult and unintelligible in itself. For, even if many among them had once been "Proselytes of the Gate," or attendants on the Synagogue, still they would mostly be without the deeper Old Testament training of Jews, and familiarity with Jewish ideas. In the Synagogues the Bible was read from the Hebrew text, which few Jews and no Gentiles understood; in some, however, it was afterwards read in Greek, or interpreted. But it was long before hearing these lessons could suffice to make Proselytes familiar with a circle of ideas so entirely new and strange to them. Still less could the numerous Gentiles who came straight into the Church without any previous acquaintance with Judaism follow the course of thought and

[1] 2 Pet. iii. 16.

argumentation in the apostolic writings. For the apostles retained their Jewish education and notions, though transfigured and spiritualized by Christ; and their whole writings are penetrated by this view. The very proofs the apostle of the Gentiles found in the Old Testament must have seemed scarcely comprehensible to a Greek Christian. Only after years spent in Christian communion, and after having *lived into* the apostolic habit of thought, could he find himself at home in these Epistles.

The New Testament Scriptures do not attest their own inspiration: the authors never tell us what they thought of their own writings. No one says anywhere that he wrote by divine suggestion. But they felt, whether teaching orally or writing, as men under the guidance and suggestion of the Holy Ghost. Through Him, they said, is the revelation given us; it is He, sent from Heaven, who speaks through us; our office is a ministry of the Holy Ghost, a continuation of Christ's.[1] Paul, indeed, distinguished between commands of the Lord proclaimed in His name, and precepts derived from his own insight and judgment; but he knew that even these originated under the influence of the Holy Ghost communicated to him, and were thus commandments of the Lord.[2]

The writings which make up what afterwards became the New Testament were composed between 54 and 98 A.D. The Church, therefore, had been guided by oral

[1] Eph. iii. 5. 1 Cor. ii. 10. 2 Cor. iii. 8; v. 20. 1 Pet. i. 12.
[2] 1 Cor. vii. 10, 12, 25, 40; xiv. 37.

teaching, under the immediate influence of Christ and the apostles, for more than twenty years, before a word of it was written; and what was written grew up in her bosom, out of the fulness of doctrinal and practical knowledge she already possessed. It was nowhere said or assumed in these most ancient documents, which do not bear testimony to themselves, that men were to take the writings of the apostles and their disciples for the sole rule of faith and discipline, and to seek in them alone the knowledge of God's revelation. Neither was it anywhere said or hinted that the apostles had written down all that was essential for believers, or all they had taught by word of mouth. At the end of his earthly course Paul referred his disciple Timothy, not to his Epistles or the writings of other apostles, but to what he had heard him teach orally; that teaching he was to hand on to trustworthy men, to be faithfully preserved and imparted.[1] It was, then, this oral tradition which appeared to the apostle the fittest means for securing Christian doctrine pure and genuine to after generations, when the first generation of disciples was passed away. Even when he did refer them to an earlier Epistle addressed to them, to whose contents they were to adhere, he did not forget to mention first what they had been taught by "word," as the richer source of information.[2]

The doctrinal traditions of the Jewish necessarily passed into the Christian Church. Christ Himself had recognised them, taught out of them, and referred His disciples to the authority of those who sat in Moses'

[1] 2 Tim. ii. 2. [2] 2 Thess. ii. 15.

seat, who were their organs.[1] And if He sharply denounced their arbitrary interpretations of the Law, and reproached them with making God's law of none effect by their own inventions, put forth as traditions of the fathers,—as in forbidding works of charity on the Sabbath, or allowing a son to let his parents starve, that he might put the money he had saved into the temple treasury,—those were perversions of individuals, or at most of whole schools; the dominant teaching was independent of them, and was rather confirmed or implied in the addresses of Christ and the apostles. From tradition came the common teaching about the resurrection, the judgment, Paradise and Gehenna, without any distinct evidence from the Hebrew Canon. A good deal in the New Testament about the angels and fallen spirits comes, not from the Bible, but tradition. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews has got from the same source his statements about the contents of the Ark—the vessel of manna and Aaron's rod—and about the details of the sacrificial ritual; and Paul his notion of a heavenly Jerusalem, and a third heaven, and the names of the Egyptian magicians, Jannes and Jambres.[2] The assertions of Peter and Jude about the sin and punishment of the fallen angels are similarly drawn from Jewish tradition.[3]

Thus the religious consciousness of Judaism, in which the apostles, the first Christian teachers, and most of the

[1] Matt. xxiii. 3.

[2] Heb. ix. 4. Gal. iv. 26. 2 Cor. xii. 2. 2 Tim. iii. 8.

[3] 2 Pet. ii. 4. Jude 6.

first believers, had been brought up and had lived a longer or shorter time, flowed in unbroken stream into the Christian Church; and the Jewish became the Christian tradition. There was no violent break or formal renunciation; Christianity claimed to be, not a reformation, but a fulfilment of Judaism, expectation passing into possession, the worship of a Redeemer who had come, instead of looking for a future one, the Law spiritualized into the Gospel, a world-religion and universal Church opening its gates to every nation, instead of a mere fellowship of blood and race, a Church (*Ecclesia*) instead of a Synagogue. The Christians were conscious of being in communion with all pious Israelites up to that time, and if they threw aside as having no significance for them the Pharisaic tradition about the use of the ceremonial Law, the "hedge of the Law," and the like, they claimed for themselves all its real benefits, the sacred books, the doctrinal tradition, the moral law as expanded by Christ, and even the ritual Law in its principles, with a priesthood, altar, and sacrifice, divested of their former typical and carnal character. The Psalms were their manual of prayer and praise, baptism took the place of circumcision, the Paschal feast was transfigured into the Eucharistic celebration of sacrifice and communion, and the Jewish priesthood, with its descent from father to son after the flesh, when brought to an end by the destruction of the temple, was replaced by the spiritual succession of the teaching and priestly ministry among Christians. Thus the Christian consciousness and life were an outgrowth of the Jewish.

For the first quarter of a century from the Lord's Ascension, when the Church existed without any written documents, she lived on the recollections of Christ, the spoken words of His apostles and disciples, and the Jewish Scriptures and tradition. In the bosom of the Church, as an expression and embodiment of the Spirit that ruled and the tradition laid up within it, the New Testament Scriptures were written in the course of fifty years. By the light of this Spirit, filling the Church and guiding her from generation to generation, both people and pastors read, understood, and expounded these writings. Men did not miss any thing in them, or find any thing obscure, uncertain, or doubtful, while they possessed the living commentary and supplement in the Church's oral traditions, in the intellectual and moral convictions which lived in the hearts and on the lips of believers.

The crucified Christ, whom the apostles preached, was "to the Jews an offence, to the Gentiles foolishness." Yet troops of converts thronged into the Church, because they believed the apostles, *i.e.* were convinced that they were the messengers and plenipotentiaries of One higher, and their message true. As soon as they had become members of the Church, they were ready to learn and to obey, to submit inwardly and sincerely to the whole teaching proclaimed by an apostle, and laid up in the Church. They had not come in to wrangle and to choose, to take one article and reject another which displeased them; that would only be a sign that they were wanting in real faith.

Thus, Paul thanks God that the Thessalonians had received the word he preached, not as man's, but as God's word.[1] Those who demanded belief in this word were a handful of uneducated Galileans, and a Pharisee, who himself described his teaching as folly in comparison with what then passed for truth.[2] But they were the only persons of that day who believed themselves, and therefore won belief. By them the Church was built on faith, and became a school of faith. Much as there was in Christian doctrine repulsive and burdensome, dark and mysterious, for the natural man, every one learnt in the Church to bow his mind and will under her authority, and to regard her as the embodiment of the Holy Ghost instructing the nations of the earth, bearing outward witness to what the Spirit taught within, and holding her mission from Christ as He from His Father. And thus Christians found release from false confidence in men, from the labour and insecurity of searching, and the torment of doubt and uncertainty. They had not a book handed them from which they were to extract a summary of *credenda* with painful uncertainty, and at the risk of misconception, but were referred to a living, ever-speaking authority, open and accessible to all. This belief, that God had spoken first by the apostles, and still spoke in His Church, gave them rest in its certainty, and formed the rule and support of their whole lives; and thus all their powers were directed to action, and their one aim was to make their life a genuine reflection of the faith by whose power they were possessed.

[1] 1 Thess. ii. 13. [2] 1 Cor. i. 21.

From the year 68, after the death of Peter and Paul, the greater part of the Church found itself deprived of the personal authority of the apostles. Yet the Church increased rapidly; Jews and Gentiles were eager to be received and instructed. To the question, What is your faith? what must I believe and do? the rulers of the Church answered, not by pointing to a collection of apostolical writings, for the sufficient reason that no fixed collection existed for a long time, each community having some fragments only, more or fewer. The Catechumen was referred to oral tradition. Thus, he was told, have the apostles received from Christ, and we from them and their disciples. A brief summary of the chief articles of faith was given him (such as is comprised in the oldest creed reaching back into apostolic times); living in the Church, intercourse with elder believers, taking part in worship and hearing sermons,—all this supplied what he needed, and completed his Christian education. He believed on testimony, while its actual truth shone upon him. We here, they told him, are but a fraction of the whole great Church spread already over Asia, Africa, and Europe. As we believe and teach so believe and teach all Churches founded immediately or mediately by apostles or their disciples. We write to each other, send charitable gifts, are visited by believers of other communities; there is everywhere one and the same doctrine. Whether, as in Ephesus, an apostle still teaches, or, as elsewhere, the third or fourth successor sits already where once an apostle sat, the contents and

the certainty of the witness borne is everywhere the same. In believing our words you believe the teaching of the whole Church, and, therefore, of the Holy Ghost. For Christ has promised and given to His Church this Spirit of truth, and, therefore, she can teach nothing but truth. For us, our Church is a member of the Body quickened by this Spirit; this connection and membership is our guarantee for the purity and genuineness of our doctrine, and the elder members of our community who have heard our predecessors the earlier teachers, or even the apostles themselves, testify to the younger that the same doctrine is still taught. This was the tradition of the Church. Thus every community had its own tradition witnessed and handed on from generation to generation, from bishop to bishop, from father to son; but this brook, while constantly enriching and refreshing itself from the broad stream of universal Church tradition, gave back its own streamlet again into that. So every one knew whom he believed, and on whose testimony he staked his salvation. He did not believe in himself or his own independent study of certain documents, nor build his faith on conclusions drawn according to his own gifts and acquirements from comparing passages in those documents, but in the last resort on the testimony of the Church, whereof Christ said that He would found it on a rock, and place it under the protection and guidance of the Spirit of Truth.

Thus the faith of individuals was based on the double testimony of the Church, human and divine, the testi-

mony received by the younger generation from the older in every community, and the concurrent testimony each particular Church received from the rest, and thereby from the universal Church. In the apostolic succession of her bishops the Church had a certainty, like that of the contemporary philosophical schools as to the continuity of their doctrine, that her teaching was identical with that proclaimed at the beginning; only the succession of so many Churches made the security much greater. But every Church had besides a higher certainty of its own which excluded all doubt or possibility of error, in its membership with the body of the universal Church. Enlightened, confirmed, and set at rest by this testimony, and already possessed by a fixed conception of faith, individuals whose zeal so inclined them read what they could procure of the Gospels and apostolic Epistles, and found there a confirmation of what they had been taught. They read these writings as part of the general tradition of the Church, its first written part. As the oral teaching consigned to the Church and rooted in it was here first embodied in written memorials, so was it also in the next and subsequent generations. The Church in every period produced a literature consisting of monuments of her contemporary tradition, and thus a part of what lived in the minds of believers was constantly fixed in writing, though, of course, the whole matter of belief existing and energizing in the Church did not attain full expression in literature and ecclesiastical records; for it is impossible to reduce to writing the whole life,

thought, and mind of a great community like the Church. The living belief of every generation or period, again, was nourished from the records of former ages, above all from those of the apostles. And thus every period of Church history felt the influence of those which had gone before, through the living organism which bound together the past and present of the Church by the unfailing power of the Divine promise, "I am with you to the end of the world," by her inheritance of laws and customs, by the teachers who being dead yet lived and spoke in their writings.

What the apostles transmitted to the Church by writing or by word of mouth was no compendium of ready-made articles of belief, no catalogue of dogmas fixed in matter and form, which it would have been the sole office of the Church to guard carefully in her memory and in the documents committed to her, and thus to preserve the heirloom of doctrine, a lifeless property once for all made up. The first deposit of doctrine was a living thing, which was to have an organic growth, and expand from its roots by a law of inward necessity and in a manner corresponding to the intellectual needs of believers in different ages, and to find its adequate expression. It consisted mainly of facts, principles, dogmatic germs, and indications containing in themselves the outline and capability of successive developments and doctrinal formation, since they held dynamically a rich store of dogma. In conformity with the historical character of Christianity, and analogous to the common life of the Church, there was also to be

a corresponding, progressive development and building up of doctrine, without change of its essence. It was the work of the co-operative mental toil of the most enlightened Christians, lasting on through centuries and always building on the foundation laid by their predecessors, and of a deepening search into holy Scripture, whence the instructions and germs of truth it contained were gradually brought to light. This expansion from within resulted from the very nature of a Divine communication designed to penetrate and control, not only the moral domain, but the whole mental life of man, and bearing in itself an inexhaustible treasure of implicit consequences; it resulted equally from the ineradicable craving and tendency of the human spirit to sink deeper into this doctrine, to shape it into a coherent system, and to appropriate it in all its ramifications to the satisfaction of the scientific understanding. To this was added an external necessity, arising from the endeavours of heretics gradually to change or decompose all Christian doctrines, for strengthening the points that were menaced and surrounding them, as it were, with bulwarks of wider and deeper definitions, for guarding the doctrinal deposit against every attempt of a one-sided or thoroughly perverse interpretation and wrong development, and thence for mapping out its details, and exhibiting its full contents secured and fixed by ecclesiastical decision. In such cases Church tradition, represented by the common sentiment of Christians which was injured or threatened, raised a loud and unanimous protest and demanded

positive definitions. The whole history of the Church displays an advancing process of doctrinal development, in which the human mind necessarily takes part, not, indeed, unaided or left to its natural movements, but guided by the Paraclete, the Teacher given to the Church. And thus, in the last resort, this rearing and consolidation of the doctrinal fabric was the work of the same Spirit to whom are due the doctrinal contents of the New Testament; and whatever of narrowness, error, or passion was mixed with the process, from the fault of its human instruments, was, in the long run, remedied through the higher energy of the Divine indwelling Spirit, and consumed, as in a purifying spiritual fire.

Christian doctrine, from its mental and moral elevation, its mysteries transcending vulgar comprehension, and its strictness inexorable to vulgar weaknesses, is exposed more than any other religious system to the destructive assaults or modifying influences of human inclinations, whether selfish appetite or narrowness of mind, and thus incurs the danger of being deformed and degraded into an instrument of self-seeking or short-sighted passion. This peril which menaced her dearest treasure, her very principle of life, the Church met by her possession and use of the apostolic writings and other records of faith, new or old, by her strong position as the necessary organ for guarding tradition and cutting off impure or destructive elements, and by the protection and abiding illumination of the Holy Ghost. Through that period the prevalent doctrine or tradition of the Church was a product at once human and divine,

resulting from the co-operation and interpenetration of divine powers and human teaching and belief, the outcome of the faith and life of all past generations. The inward growth and gradual unfolding into their consequences of the germs and principles of Christian dogma, the gradual expansion in the mind of the Church of isolated and hitherto undeveloped truths, the multiplication and widening scope of ecclesiastical decisions and formularies,—all this took place through the combined action of three forces and forms of activity in the Church, the logical faculty, the learned investigation of Scripture and ancient ecclesiastical literature and tradition, and an enlightened devotion feeding on Scripture and contemplation of the mysteries. So, too, in the ages before Christ, religious knowledge required above a thousand years to advance from the simple facts and articles of the Patriarchal creed to the elaborate doctrinal system of the Jewish contemporaries of Jesus,—Pharisees such as Gamaliel or Paul before his conversion. And this development was the common result of a growing Revelation, and of the action of the human mind confined to one nation only, whereas the most gifted nations of three quarters of the world have taken part for eighteen centuries in the development of Christian doctrine.

And thus in no age of the Church, from Christ and the apostles till now, could her faith and teaching differ from what it was yesterday; the continuity of the stream of tradition allowed neither the sudden nor gradual submersion of a doctrine by its opposite; never

could a truth once accepted in the Church be lost, or sink from the dignity of an article of faith to a mere tolerated opinion. The right understanding of doctrine and the corresponding interpretation of the apostolical writings passed on like the links of an unbroken chain. The criticism which guarded it belonged in principle to every faithful Christian, pre-eminently to the organized hierarchy which inherited the apostolic office. The rejection of every strange doctrine resulted simply from the perception that it directly or by implication contradicted that handed down from their forefathers. Every one, layman or clergyman, could take part according to his talents, in the inquiry, and offer his contribution to the common stock in the great process of forming and developing Christian doctrine; he could do so with the more confidence as knowing he was carried on and secured by the body of which he was a member, the Church whose judgment, spoken or implied, favourable or unfavourable, would sooner or later decide on the merit or demerit, the truth or error of his interpretations and views, if only he and his adherents had a fixed and humble faith, so as not to desire to set their minds, above that of the Church.

CHAPTER II.

DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY TRINITY, THE INCARNATION AND REDEMPTION.

When the apostle of the Gentiles said, "It pleased God to reveal His Son in me," he meant that the inward Being of the glorified Jesus had been disclosed to him by an immediate communication from heaven. Christ had repeatedly appeared to him, so that he bears witness of what he has seen. According to his view, "Christ from heaven" is the antithesis to our earthly father, Adam; for he saw the glory of God shine in the face of Christ.[1] Between the Son and the Father there is an inward and unshared fellowship of Being, so that the whole Substance of the Father is expressed in the Son, and He as His Image reveals the otherwise invisible Father, as the brightness of the sun is manifested in its rays. By Him and in Him (by a creative act of His Person) were all things made; as the Mediator of the divine work He has formed the whole universe, and is

[1] Gal. j. 15, 16. Acts xxii. 17 sqq. 1 Cor. xv. 47. 2 Cor. iv. 6.

Himself the First-born of all creation, begotten not created, from the substance of God. With the glorified Body of the ascended Christ before him, the apostle uses the expression, "the whole fulness of the Godhead dwells bodily in Him," the fulness of the Divine essence; not of Divine grace.[1] Though speaking here of the Incarnate Son, Paul has in his eye the Son in His eternal nature too, while he says of Him that He was in the form of God (the possession of divine glory) but thought not this divine existence "a spoil," *i. e.*, did not look on His equality with God as man regards and jealously watches over property he has stolen and is always fearing to be deprived of, but, rather, emptied Himself by His Incarnation and taking the form of a servant.[2] Therefore the whole world of spirits must bend the knee to His Name. Paul designates alike the Incarnate Redeemer in His earthly pilgrimage or heavenly exaltation, and the divine pre-existent Person whom God sent down from heaven, as the Son, the Only Son of God, the Son of His love. He calls Christ, God, directly in two places, once in the Epistle to the Romans, "Christ, who is over all, God blessed for ever," once in the Epistle to Titus, where he speaks of "the appearing of our great God and Saviour, Jesus Christ."[3]

[1] Heb. i. 3. Rom. viii. 32. 1 Cor. viii. 6. Col. i. 15, 16; ii. 9. [*χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως*. In Heb. i. 3. is "image of His *substance*," not *Person* as in E. V. That use of *ὑπόστασις*, is much later.—TR.]

[2] Phil. ii. 6—8. [The E. V. is clearly incorrect in translating *οὐκ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο*, "thought it not robbery."—TR.]

[3] Gal. iv. 4. Rom. viii. 3.; ix. 5. Tit. ii. 13. [Here the E. V. misses the point from ignoring the article.—TR.]

John, at the beginning of his Gospel and in the Apocalypse, calls that divine Person who was incarnate in Jesus the *Logos* or "Word," not "Reason." In the time and place where John wrote his Gospel the word *Logos* was notoriously in use to signify a divine Mediator, a second Person next to God or the "Father." The sources whence this notion and title were derived, and from which John directly or indirectly adopted them, are to be sought in Genesis, in the deutero-canonical books, and in the religious philosophy of the Alexandrian Jews. John had learnt from the very mouth of Jesus that He had His glory with the Father before the world was made, and that the Father had given to the Son to have life in Himself. In the Apocalyptic vision Jesus appeared to Him as the Author of all creation, the Beginning and the End. In the beginning of Genesis he found the Word of God spoken of as the medium of creation; in the deutero-canonical books he read of Wisdom sitting as a foster-child and companion by the Father's throne from the beginning, before the worlds were, fashioning all things, being the brightness of the Eternal Light, which pierces and gives life to all, having a dwelling-place among all nations, but a special inheritance in Israel.[1]

The Alexandrian teaching of Philo gave him the right expression for all this, though, indeed, the *Logos* of Philo is far other than that of John. The *Logos* of Philo is a second God, only improperly called God; and Philo commends the Jews for not worshipping

[1] Prov. viii. 23 sqq. Ecclus. xxiv. 6—9. Wisd. vii. 23 sqq.

the representative Revealer, the *Logos*, but the Almighty God who is exalted over all "nature of the Logos."[1] His *Logos* is properly the Platonic ideal, the archetype of order and harmony in the material world; not the Creator, but the pattern and archetype after which God has created and ordered the world. But the *Logos* of John is not the instrument or subject of the divine thought, the idea, but a personal self-existent *hypostasis*. He is neither pattern nor archetype, but self-creative; by Him the worlds were made. With Philo the *Logos* is the Fountain of all light in man, spiritual or physical; with John, He is only the intellectual and moral Light, that lightens every man, and strives with the moral and mental darkness of the world. Philo acknowledges no closer relation of his *Logos* to the Messiah, nor any Incarnation of it; for his *Logos*, whose personality he failed to grasp, and which was ever fading into an abstraction, could not become man.

But John names the pre-existent Lord the *Logos*, not only because he found the title ready to hand, but because it served best to express the nature and office of the Son. The Son is the "Word," because, as words are the expression of thought, so He is the Expression of the Father's Substance and the Reflection of His glory, having His Being from the Father, as a word is the formed utterance of the speaker's thought. John says, in the "Revelation," of the Rider appearing on a white horse (Christ), that He bore a name secret and

[1] Phil. *Opp. Ed. Mangey* i. 413; ii. 625.

unspeakable, which none but Himself knew; but he adds that His name was called the "Word of God," as though he would say, this name came nearest among men to that divine name which adequately expresses the Being of the Son.[1]

In his Prologue John describes the divine Word as well in His divine nature and operations before all time, as in His human manifestation. But He ascribes Sonship, not first to the incarnate, but to the pre-existent Christ. "In the beginning was the Word," that is, from all eternity, not in the beginning of creation; He was God, and with or near God,[2] not an emanation from God, or a second substance outside Him, or a second god, but all which belongs to God is His; He has part in the fulness of God's glory, and, before the worlds were made, God, the Father, is the object of His energy, His vision, and His will. He is the Only Born of the Father, for He is the Word the Father has outspoken into separate personal existence out of the fulness of His Being, and by whom alone He speaks.

This *Logos* is, and was, the organ and medium of creation; by Him all was made, and He alone is Life, and gives life, of body or of soul; for in Him all life is contained as its Principle and Fountain. As the Light of man He shone into the darkness which grew out of man's alienation from God, even before He was incarnated; but the darkness comprehended Him not, and when He came as Man to His own people the

[1] Apoc. xix. 12, 13. [2] *πρὸς τὸν θεὸν*. John i. 1.

multitude of them rejected Him. The world, as the apostles teach, was created not only by, but for, the Son, and for His sake; for He is its immediate End, in Him its every end is realised, and, therefore, has God given it Him for an inheritance, and put all things under His feet.[1]

Christ first mentioned the Holy Ghost when He promised His disciples Another in His place, a Paraclete, a divine Comforter and Helper. But He said it was only after His departure, and when He was glorified with the Father, that He could and would send to them this Spirit, who would compensate for the loss of His bodily presence.[2] The whole work of the Incarnation must first be accomplished, redemption wrought, the way re-opened to the Father, and human nature exalted and glorified; the disciples must first be made ready to receive Him, and the material prepared for building up the future Church, before Christ could send the Holy Ghost, who would then make the disciples into living stones of that edifice, and take up His abiding habitation in it. As the Son by Incarnation bound human nature to Himself, the Spirit by indwelling carried on and completed His work; He erected a Kingdom on earth which, as a living organisation, has Christ for its Head and King, Himself sent from the Father and the Son for its animating Soul, Christians for its members. He, therefore, is the Principle of Church communion and unity; He glorifies Christ in the Church, which is the perpetual manifestation of the life of Christ, Christ

[1] Col. i. 16. Heb. i. 2. Eph. i. 22. [2] John xiv. 16; xv. 26.

being the Head, the Church the collective body of His members.[1] He convinces the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment. For, as Spirit of the Church, He is an abiding Revelation and unceasing Witness of the sinfulness of the world at irreconcilable enmity with the Church, so that the world, as the domain of the natural life under the power of delusion and sin, displays itself in all its emptiness and falsehood. He, further, testifies of the righteousness of Christ's cause, the Redeemer now exalted to the glory of the Father, and thence invisibly ruling the Church; and of the judgment already accomplished upon Satan and his worldly dominion.[2]

This Spirit is the Spirit of Truth; as such He exhibits His power in the Church, imparting to her truth by imparting Himself. He reminds the Church of all that Christ had said, He teaches her what the disciples could not bear while Christ was personally with them, and by enlightening and sanctifying her members gives them a living apprehension of what they before had not understood, and fits them for full and perfect knowledge. And, by combining gradually into a whole in the Church's mind the scattered intimations in the words of Christ, He leads her into all the truth.[3] It is thus His office to preserve in the Church pure and perfect the tradition of Christ and of His entire teaching. He speaks not, Christ says, of Himself, but only what He has heard from the Father and the Son, as Christ

[1] 1 Cor. xii. 12. [2] John xvi. 8—11.
[3] John xiv. 26; xv. 26; xvi. 12—15.

said of Himself, that He only spoke what He had heard of the Father, only acted and spoke after the Father's will and suggestion.[1] As the Son can do nothing of Himself, but what He sees the Father do, *i.e.* as in word and work He only proclaims and embodies the divine thought He sees in the Bosom of the Father, so too the Holy Ghost works not alone, standing apart and arbitrarily, but He "receives of the Son."[2] Thus there is a personal distinction and living circuminsession of Father, Son and Spirit.

All Christ had predicted of the mission and operations of the Holy Ghost was abundantly fulfilled. The disciples felt His power and energy in themselves, as bearers of the apostolic office, in the believers, and in the Church. Thus the lie of Ananias and his wife seemed to them not merely a sin against man, but against the Holy Ghost, who energized in the apostles, as Christ's representatives, and in the Church; and Paul describes the Corinthians as inhabited by the Holy Ghost, and therefore a holy temple of God that may not be defiled.[3] To this Spirit belongs pre-eminently the seeking out the deep things of God, the knowledge of His innermost being and most hidden thoughts and counsels, and He alone can possess and communicate this knowledge, just as none but his own spirit knows the counsels and designs of a man.[4] In individual believers sanctifica-

[1] John v. 19; viii. 28: xii. 49.
[2] ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ. Ib. xvi. 13, 14.
[3] Acts v. 4, 5. 1 Cor. iii. 16, 17. Cf. Eph. ii. 19; 1 Pet. ii. 5.
[4] 1 Cor. ii. 10, 11.

tion, or love, with its fulness of works and virtues, is a fruit of the Holy Ghost.[1] It is He too who, when He has perfected these operations in a man, assures him of being a child of God, while the testimony of his own conscience corresponds with that of the Divine Spirit. And, therefore, He is also the Pledge of our perfection in heaven.[2]

The Divine Trinity, or Godhead, unfolding Itself in Three Subjects, is proclaimed in the baptismal formula prescribed by Christ as the foundation doctrine of Christianity.[3] Every one received into the Church was to confess his belief in the Father, the Son, and the Spirit, and to come into communion with the Father, through the Son, with the Son, through the Holy Ghost. The Trinity is always spoken of only from its economical side, that is in relation to the method of human salvation.[4] But the ontological relationship of the Divine Persons to each other lies at the root of this, and is implied; and, where the apostles only name the Lord or the Spirit as the Giver of grace, we must understand the common operation of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Thus Paul distinguishes gifts as conferred by the Son, and ministries by the Spirit, operations (gifts and ministries) as wrought by the Father (God), yet refers all notices of these gifts to the Holy Ghost; such, again, is the drift of his threefold farewell salutation to the

[1] 2 Thess. ii. 13. 1 Pet. i. 2. Gal. v. 22. Rom. xv. 30.

[2] Rom. viii. 16. 2 Cor. i. 22; v. 5. Eph. i. 14.

[3] Matt. xxviii. 19.

[4] [Economy (*οἰκονομία*) is a favourite term with the Greek Fathers for the Incarnation.—Tr.]

Corinthians, the grace of Christ, the love of God (the Father), and the fellowship of the Holy Ghost; so Peter, in his opening salutation, comprehends the economy of salvation in election, according to the foreknowledge of the Father, sanctification, through the Spirit, and sprinkling with the blood of Christ, *i.e.* admission into the covenant of His atoning death.[1]

The history of Jesus and the apostles contains frequent mention of angelic appearances, at the birth of the Lord, in Gethsemane, at the grave, at the Ascension, in Peter's prison, and elsewhere. These lofty beings are also spoken of in the discourses of Christ and the apostolic Epistles, as a thing well known and assumed, and the Sadducean denial of them appears something so strange to religious Jews, as not to call for notice. According to the utterances of Christ and the Apostles, the angel-world is an ordered spiritual kingdom with many gradations; it contains angels who excel in strength and power, or archangels. John sees seven angels of the highest rank standing before God's throne, one of whom, Gabriel, says himself that he stands before God, and the Prophet beholds myriads of myriads in wider circle around God and the elders.[2] They are all creatures who have attained their perfection, and are in peaceful enjoyment of blessings offered to the future expectation of men, holy, immortal, in the abiding com-

[1] 2 Thess. iii. 18. 2 Tim. iv. 22. 1 Cor. xii. 4—7. 2 Cor. xiii. 14. 1 Pet. i. 2.

[2] 2 Pet. ii. 11. Jude 9. 1 Thess. iv. 16. Apoc. i. 4; v. 11. Luke i. 19.

munion and immediate neighbourhood of God; they minister before Him, and are sent forth by Him, and He honours them by letting them take part in His own acts. Yet their knowledge is finite, and their understanding capable of progress; they long to look into the divine economy of redemption.[1]

At the beginning of His ministry Jesus said to His disciples, "Ye shall see angels ascend and descend upon the Son of Man." They bow their knees at the Name of Jesus, and all, the very highest, who serve Him, minister to them that believe. They are interested in the destiny and circumstances of His Church; its divine foundation and guidance is for them a mirror which reflects anew the wisdom of God. They rejoice over the repentance of but one sinful soul. John salutes the Churches of Asia Minor in the name of the seven angels before the throne of God; Michael is now the Protector of the Church, and Paul adjures Timothy by God, by Christ, and by the angels, to fulfil his duties. Every man has his own guardian angel; even the least among the regenerate, as Jesus said, have their angels, who always behold the Face of God, and when first the disciples saw Peter on his release from prison, they took it for his angel. In the apocalyptic vision, the angels unite their prayers with those of the pious on earth, and present them before God; an angel mingles heavenly incense with the prayers of the Saints, which ascend like incense smoke, to make them acceptable to God. Angels and men form one great organization, and God has united all in heaven and on earth into one, for His

[1] Luke xx. 36. 1 Pet. i. 12.

service and glory, under Christ as Head, and by virtue of His atonement.[1]

But the New Testament often speaks also of a kingdom of evil angels, to which the Incarnation of the Word, His earthly work, and the Church with its institutions and gifts, are opposed. Christ came to destroy the works of the devil. There is no Prince or Head of the whole kingdom of good angels mentioned, but there is constant mention of a mighty ruler of the kingdom of darkness, and of evil spirits subject to him. It is he, in whose being and life is no truth, who began the great apostasy, and by whose free choice evil entered into that world which God had created good. He appears as one hardened in fixed contradiction and irreconcilable enmity against God, a spirit that hates all good, whose kingdom is everywhere thwarting, destroying, and tempting to apostasy the kingdom of God. He is the great dragon, the old serpent, the lying spirit hating truth, who sinned from the beginning. Man found evil in existence; it originates not with him, but he is tempted to it, and because, through deceit of Satan, sin, and with it death, both of soul and body, came upon mankind, therefore is Satan called the ruler of death, and a murderer from the beginning.[2]

The spirits who belong in fixed ranks and gradations

[1] 1 Pet. i. 12. John i. 51. Phil. ii. 10. Heb. i. 14. Eph. iii. 10. Luke xv. 7, 10. Apoc. i. 1; xii. 7; viii. 3. 1 Tim. v. 21. Matt. xviii. 10. Acts xii. 15. Eph. i. 10. [Matt. xviii. 10 does not confine guardian angels to the "regenerate."—Tr.]

[2] 1 John iii. 8. John viii. 44. Heb. ii. 14.

to the kingdom of this master kept not their original power and glory, but left their proper sphere in the realm of light, and were therefore thrust down into the place of darkness, where they are reserved in chains of darkness for a last decision of their fate.[1] The darkness of this world is the region to which and by which they are bound, and where they rule. They are lords of the world, whose element is the darkness natural to its present state, the whole moral and religious condition of the Heathen world; they are the "spirits of wickedness," who have their dwelling in the air surrounding this earth, impure spirits banished from the kingdom and service of God, and become slaves of Satan, the instruments and ministers of his hostility to God and man.[2] They believe that God is, but being apostates from His love, and hardened in selfishness, tremble before Him, knowing or suspecting that He will take away their dominion over the Heathen world, and judge them.[3] The "demoniacs," or possessed, who existed in considerable numbers in Palestine and throughout Heathendom, many of whom were delivered by the word of Jesus and His apostles and disciples, were conspicuous examples of the power of these spirits at a time when they collected all their strength in vindication of their menaced dominion. A demoniacal influence was exerted on the animal nature of these persons, with the symptoms of epilepsy, madness, and deafness; they felt themselves in

[1] Jude 6. 2 Pet. ii. 4. [2] Eph. vi. 12. [3] James ii. 19.

bondage, and their body and its organs subjected to an alien mastery.[1]

The moral and religious condition of that age explains why Satan is named the Prince of this world, or the god of the present world, that is of the era characterised by Heathen dominion.[2] His spirits receive the Heathen worship. The idol sacrificed to, as Paul says, is nothing, a mere work of men's hands, with no corresponding reality, of which it is a representation; but the gods of the Heathen are actually existing, not powerless beings; they are demons, and sacrifices offered to them are offered to demons. "There are many gods, and many lords, in heaven, and on earth, but we Christians have one God, the Father, and one Lord, Jesus Christ."[3] Thus, Satan's kingdom is of wide extent, for not only fallen spirits, but men estranged from God by sin and error, belong to it. But the kingdom of Christ is opposed to it, and through His redeeming work Satan will be driven from the domain he has hitherto ruled; his power to mar the Lord's work, by sowing tares among the wheat, and mixing poison with the fountains of health, is decreasing, and destined at last to vanish before the power of God. Till then, he knows how, both by violence and cunning,—for he can transform himself into an angel of light—to attack men on their weakest

[1] Luke vi. 18; ix. 39; xiii. 16. Matt. xvii. 15. Acts viii. 7; xvi. 16.

[2] John xii. 31; xiv. 30. 2 Cor. iv. 4. Cf. Eph. ii. 2.

[3] 1 Cor. viii. 4—6; x. 19, 20. 1 John v. 19.

side, so as to bring them under his power, or hold them fast in his snares, through sin and unbelief.[1]

The Word became Flesh; that divine Being who existed long before the birth of Jesus, yea, before creation, was born on earth "in man's likeness." He appeared at the predestined time sent forth from God, in the likeness of our sinful nature, only that in Him it was and remained sinless.[2] In His outward appearance, attitude, and mien, all was human; but He was not *a* man, like all others, He was the incarnate Son of God, in a condition of abasement and humility into which "He emptied Himself," exchanging for the form of a servant His divine form and the glory He had with the Father. Though rich and the Ruler of the world, for our sakes He became poor.[3] The apostolic Epistles do not dwell on His supernatural generation without earthly father, but it is always assumed, and Paul intimates it in saying, "Christ was born of a woman."[4] According to Paul's teaching, Christ could not be a descendant of Adam, because He is opposed to him as the Second Adam, the father of a new race.

Christ came as Mediator, Reconciler, and Redeemer. He is Mediator, from the fact of being Man, for in Him human nature in its sinless purity was exalted to the closest personal fellowship with the Godhead, and He, as the Second Adam, has the office and the power, and means

[1] Acts xxvi. 18. Col. i. 13. 1 Cor. v. 4, 5. John xii. 31. 2 Tim. ii. 26. Matt. xiii. 28. Apoc. *passim*. 2 Cor. xi. 13. Rom. xvi. 20. Eph. vi. 11. 1 Pet. v. 8.

[2] Phil. ii. 6—8. Rom. viii. 3. Heb. ii. 14. [3] 2 Cor. viii. 9.

[4] Gal. iv. 4.

to cleanse men from sin and unite them to Himself.[1] For, in His full union, on one side with God, on the other with humanity, He, and He alone, is in a position to put away the enmity of man against God, by the real removal of the sin which divides them. Therefore did He not only devote His whole earthly life, without any personal reserves, to that great mission, by a continuous self-oblation, but crowned and closed it by the sacrifice of a voluntary death for the sins of men, so that His whole life was an atonement; all its moral acts were a chain of propitiatory acts for the sins of men. Through atonement, also, the Mediator wrought reconciliation with God, and became the Author of a new covenant between man and God, based on His sacrificial death.[2]

Thus God Himself is the highest Cause of Redemption; He reconciles men with Himself through Christ, and is, therefore, called Saviour.[3] He has reconciled us, the whole race of men, and thereby made each individual of it meet for grace, when we were His enemies, children of wrath, and the objects of divine displeasure.[4] But, as this displeasure is nothing else than the holiness of God in its relation to men, the reconciliation comes from the love of God. He so loved the world—while hating its sin and moral corruption—that, to unite His love with His holiness and

[1] 1 Tim. ii. 5. Heb. ix. 15. Eph. v. 29, 30. 1 Cor. x. 16—18.

[2] John x. 17, 18. 1 Cor. xi. 25. Gal. iv. 24. Heb. vii. 22; viii. 6; ix. 15.

[3] 2 Cor. v. 18, 19. Rom. iii. 25. Luke i. 47. 1 Tim. i. 1. Tit. iii. 4.

[4] Rom. v. 11. Eph. ii. 3.

righteousness, He gave up His Son and sent Him into the world.[1]

And thus the Incarnation of the Son, and His willingly endured death on the Cross, reveal and harmonise in act the love and the righteousness of God. God first loved us; we have not become the objects of His love in consequence of Christ's atonement, but rather the sending of the Son was itself an act, and most conspicuous evidence, of His original love, a love not evoked by ours, but preceding it while we were estranged from Him. "While we were yet sinners, Christ died for us;" we have seen what love is, and how far it goes in self-sacrifice, as John says, in Christ giving up His life for us.[2] As, in the time before Christ, God, in His long-suffering, had connived at the sins of men; at last, in the fulness of time, He revealed the righteousness which had been misunderstood and concealed by that forbearance, in presenting Jesus as a Sin-offering. This was done, on the one hand, by Christ making Himself a free-will offering through the effusion of His blood; on the other, by men appropriating through faith the atoning and sanctifying power of His sacrifice.[3] Paul expresses the same great fact in saying, that Jesus became sin for us,[4] that is, without being the least sinful Himself, but of perfect innocence and sanctity, He took our place in love, and was treated as a sinner, regarded by the world as a criminal, and executed; so that He was wrapped up, clothed, and covered, as it

[1] John iii. 16, 17. [2] 1 John iii. 16; iv. 10. Rom. v. 8.
[3] Rom. iii. 25. [4] 2 Cor. v. 21.

were, with sin and its consequences, and bore its whole weight.

It was thus an offering, an act of self-surrender, forming the centre-point of all human history, by which redemption was accomplished. When men were powerless, held captive under sin, the Son, sent forth for that purpose, undertook to offer a full and free-will oblation to God, to fulfil this supreme and proper obligation of man, and thereby to restore the communion with God which sin had broken; and for this end, in the dignity and infinite worth of His Person as God-man, and in the character of Surety and Representative of the whole race, as its Head and the Second Adam, He offered this sacrifice to God for atonement and remission of human sin, by enduring the bitterest sufferings and death in the struggle with a world dominated by sin.

"I have given you the blood upon the altar, to atone your souls," was said to the Israelites.[1] Thus were the sin-offerings of the Old Testament, wherein the life of the animal in the blood was offered up, feeble shadows of the offering on Golgotha. For "without shedding of blood is no remission." Christ Himself had said, "I sanctify Myself for them (as a sacrifice), that they also may be sanctified," and had ascribed to the shedding of His blood the meaning and power of remission.[2] So, again, Peter says, Christ (as our Priest and Sin-offering) has carried our sins on His body to the wood of the cross, as to an altar, "by whose wounds you were healed;" and John calls Him the Lamb slain as the

[1] Levit. xvii. 11. [2] Heb. ix. 22. John xvii. 19.

antitype of the Paschal Lamb, who "has washed us from our sins in His blood;" the blessed "have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb."[1] Here the cleansing from sin won for us by the death of Christ, and realised by a believing self-surrender to Him, is represented under the sensible image of washing stains out of a garment.

Paul, again, says, that Christ is offered as our Paschal Lamb, like it faultless and atoning, a sign and pledge of our Exodus from the land of bondage, and offered to the taste in communion for nourishment of the Christian life.[2] Christ is expressly called in the Hebrews, the great High Priest, who presents Himself as an offering for us. As in the priesthood and sacrifice of the old Law all was external, preparatory, carnal, and imperfect, in Christ, at once Priest and Victim, all is perfected. He alone is the Priest, infinitely separated from sinners through His holiness, yet indissolubly linked to them by sharing their nature. Being One with God through His divinity, and with us through His humanity, He binds together in His Person God and man; He is the Bridge that spans the immeasurable abyss that divided us from God, and the Eternal Spirit—that is, His heavenly and immortal nature—gives to the offering of His blood and death an infinite worth. He is also such a Priest as we need, having passed through the school of temptations and bitterest pains, and thus, though without sin, shared our circumstances, sufferings, and trials; whence for every need and every temptation He offers us the

[1] 1 Pet. ii. 24. Apoc. i. 5; vii. 14; xiii. 8. [2] 1 Cor. v. 7.

right remedy.[1] And now, having entered into heaven, He continues there for all time the priesthood and sacrifice He began on earth; His glorified estate has changed nothing in His relations and offices to us; sitting Co-equal at the Father's Right Hand He is for us what He was on earth.

We are further taught, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, that the Old Testament priesthood is abolished. As the offering of the New Covenant is far exalted over those of the Old, which were but prefigurements adapted and designed to arouse a desire for the full reality they foreshadowed, so, too, is the Priest and Mediator of a better covenant, richer in promises, highly exalted above the Levitical priesthood, which was neither perfect nor tending to perfection, but subject to constant change of persons through death. He is a Priest after the order of Melchisedech, for this ancient Priest and King was a type of Christ, by uniting in his person the royal and sacerdotal dignity, by his name (king of righteousness and of peace), and by the universality of his priesthood, which, unlike the Levitical, was neither lineally transmitted, nor tied to one family or nation, nor liable to be abrogated. Thus the order of Aaron was abolished, and replaced by the eternal and unchangeable priesthood of Christ.[2]

The power of Christ's sacrifice to atone is necessarily limited by its power to sanctify. By this offering once made He has wrought an eternal sanctification.[3] In becoming sin (a sin-offering) for man He broke the power of sin, against which the Mosaic Law was im-

[1] Heb. ii. 17, 18. [2] Ib. vii.; viii. [3] Ib. x. 11—14.

potent; He has condemned and dethroned it in act in the flesh, the human nature it had hitherto ruled.[1] This was begun by the first appearing of the Son of God in the flesh. He is the Head of Humanity and second Father of believers; and from His human nature, in which the Godhead dwells, proceed those powers which assure to Christians the victory over sin they could not obtain by the law. Henceforth men are bound and able to overcome the law of sin and death in their flesh by the law of the spirit, the powers of life resting in Christ.[2] The question follows, how and by what process this work of atonement and sanctification is applied to individuals, or under what conditions each partakes of its fruits and attains to true righteousness and salvation.

Reconciliation and justification are accurately distinguished by Paul. The death of Christ on the Cross is a great work of universal redemption; He is a Maker of peace, not only for earth and the human race, but for higher regions and their inhabitants also; it is a reconciliation which embraces the universe, in which even unconscious nature has a part.[3] This was accomplished once for all on Golgotha. Thereby mankind, as a race, is restored to its true relationship with God, forgiveness of sins is won for all men; God has turned His Countenance in kindness and mercy upon them, and re-opened the treasures of His gifts of grace. Those gifts Christ has purchased, He has paid the price, and offers them

[1] Rom. viii. 3.
[2] Ib. viii. 1, 2.
[3] Col. i. 20. Eph. i. 10. Rom. viii. 17—21.

now to us. We were still enemies of God when our redemption was wrought out, and are thus redeemed or reconciled before we are individually justified.[1] Christ did that for us, and without us. Justification—the actual change from the state of sin and God's displeasure to the state of renewal and grace—was first made possible by the act of reconciliation, and is fulfilled by Christ in us, and with our aid.

All men are deficient in righteousness before God; they are sinners. The predominance of the lower sensuous impulses over the higher, self-love degenerated into self-seeking, freedom perverted into wilfulness,—in this consists the natural corruption innate in men, a kind of inherent principle of sin in the present condition of our nature, or, as Paul describes it, a law of sin dwelling in our members, our natural powers.[2] The historical origin and operating cause of this common sinfulness is that first transgression of the divine command, into which our first parents were seduced by their enemy Satan, the author of evil and sin in the world.[3] Through the lineal transmission of human nature ordained by God sin has spread from thence as a natural power, a condition innate in every one, and displeasing to God, over all mankind. It is not the act once done by Adam that is simply imparted to each individual, while yet it is not his own, but the condition of mankind which resulted from that act is a permanent and inherited one, producing sin in the whole race. Every one, through the disorder and evil condition of his nature, is unpleasing

[1] Rom. v. 10 [2] Ib. vii. 12 sqq. [3] Ib. iii. 23. 1 John i. 8.

to God; sin is in him, not as an act, but as a passion or state, the germ of a moral disease that developes itself with time, before it has yet shaped itself into actual sin. Thus, sin and death as its consequence have passed on all men born of the flesh.[1]

All men are, therefore, represented by the apostle as sinners, as well physiologically as historically, sold under sin and children of wrath, the objects of that displeasure God's holiness necessarily feels against evil.[2] But this corruption of our moral nature by the Fall is not a complete destruction of it, so that no spark of good and power for doing good remains. Man is wounded as a moral being, not killed; he is capable of redemption, and earnestly desires it.[3] The death under whose mastery sin has brought him is not only bodily but spiritual;[4] redemption is a quickening of dead humanity through faith in the Crucified and risen Redeemer; and the apostle understands under the figure of death the whole condition of sinful humanity, turned away from God, and powerless for good or for conversion of itself. But the higher powers of man created after the image of God survive the Fall; he retains the rudiments of divine knowledge, a slumbering consciousness of God only capable of developing itself in the contemplation of nature; he might, by obeying this knowledge and the inner law and voice of conscience, restrain the germ of sin within him from unfolding itself.[5] There are thus

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 21 sqq. Rom. v. 12. John iii. 6.
[2] Rom. ii. 3.; vii. Eph. ii. 3.
[3] Ib. i. 19.; ii. 14, 15.; vii. 7 sqq.
[4] Eph. ii. 1. Col. ii. 13. Rom. vii.
[5] Rom. i. 20.; ii. 14.

in the natural man points of contact for God's converting grace to seize upon; he has an inborn perception of truth, more or less darkened by sinfulnesss of life, but not extinguished, whereby he can meet on his side the message and grace which calls him to faith; and when grace has begun its work in him, then arises in him that intermediate and transitional state Paul mentions, where he inwardly longs for conversion, but oscillates between two opposites in the conflict of flesh and spirit.[1] From this condition man must advance to real righteousness and attainment of the Divine promises. And this is done not by the law and its works, but by faith. Christ stands related to the off-spring of Adam as the generous graft to the wild tree whose juices it ennobles. As sin is derived to all from Adam, so righteousness from Christ, but the instrument for receiving and appropriating it is faith.

By the Law, which he excludes from the office of justifying, Paul means the Law of Moses, such as he had always found it by experience, and such as it confronted him among his fellow-countrymen,—that complex system of political, ritual, and moral precepts embracing the whole mind and life, which formed the great and impassable barrier between Jew and Gentile. He felt that men were shut up in this law as in a prison. A Jew felt himself equally bound by all parts and details of it; he neither made, nor could make, any distinction between what was purely moral and unchangeable, and what was only temporary, adapted to former relations,

[1] Rom. vii. 17 sqq.

or such as were passing away. To him all commands were on a par, as so many revelations of the divine will binding him to a strict and literal fulfilment. He regarded all morality and piety primarily from the historical stand-point of national right, as a service of external obedience, which he paid as a member of the Israelite people and state to the law of his nation, and which ensured him a rightful claim on the divine favour, and the enjoyment of the blessings promised to obedience.

Of this written law, closely connected in all its parts, given of old to the Jews, Paul maintains that it is abolished—abolished, that is, in its formal relations, its speciality, as a national statute, embracing political, moral, and liturgical codes.[1] We preach, he says, another long promised law, stripped of all national limitations and Jewish specialities, whose contents are spiritual, and consist of principles and realities in place of typical shadows. But Paul joins and mingles the external Mosaic with the internal moral law in the conscience of men, which is God's voice in the soul, and however feeble, dark, or fallible in its utterances, is yet a law to the Heathen. This law had the same office and significance for the Gentiles as the Mosaic law for the Jews in pioneering the way for Christ.[2] Thus the apostle's statements about the law apply sometimes to the law generally, as well the external and positive as the internal, sometimes, and indeed oftenest, to the

[1] Gal. iii. 19. [2] Rom. ii. 14, 15.

latter or Mosaic law. The law in itself, and apart from its results in fallen man, is good, right, holy, spiritual; it exhibits and condemns the contradiction of the human will to the divine; by its threats and terrors it curbs and restrains the grosser outbreaks of human perversity. By the law comes the knowledge of sin; it discloses to man his indwelling evil, and thus rouses a sense of the need of redemption.[1]

On the other hand, sinful inclination is evoked by the law as a contradiction to the will of God contained in it. The requirements and monitions of the law kindle our evil tendencies and propensities into full and conscious energy, and make the law of no effect. The very presentation of the law keeps up vividly the consciousness of sin, and sin itself, for the command which checks and opposes it impels to disobedience. It is "the strength of sin," and so far a law of death.[2] At the same time, it requires that all commands without exception be obeyed; he who transgresses one is guilty of the whole law, and under the curse it threatens to transgressors.[3] It is implied, again, in the nature of the law, or rather of fallen man, that the obedience enforced is only a slavish and extorted one, creating a slavish feeling and hindering true and child-like obedience.[4] It promises life, indeed, to those who perfectly fulfil its precepts, but it does not fulfil the promise, for

[1] Rom. iii. 20; vii. 13.
[2] Ib. vii. 8. 1 Cor. xv. 56.
[3] Gal. iii. 10; v. 3. James ii. 10.
[4] Rom. viii. 15. Gal. iii. 19; iv. 1—3. 1 Tim. i. 8—10.

it cannot make alive,—only faith can do that. The law can only condemn.

Thus the law occupies a position the antithesis of the Christian. Faith and the promise of redemption were earlier than the law; the law was something transitional and intermediate, introduced on account of transgressions, not directly promulgated by God, but through angels, as a system of training for infancy, to elicit first in men the consciousness of the misery of sin. It is by no means to have force for ever, but its end is Christ; with His appearance, and the coming in of His new dispensation of faith, the educational office of the law ceases, and believers are no more under it.[1] Christ has changed for His followers the dispensation of the law into the dispensation of grace, which could only be introduced when the law was taken away, and so the apostle teaches that the whole Mosaic law in its previous form, without distinction of ritual or moral precepts, has no further binding force. Thus he opposes to the blessing of Abraham, consisting in the promise of the Spirit received through faith, the curse which presses on every observer of the law through the law itself; from that curse Christ has redeemed the Jews who believe on Him, because by the manner of His death—hanging on a tree—He made Himself a curse in the eyes of men, according to the expression of the law, and endured a death which the law regarded as a curse

[1] Gal. iii. 19—27.

and object of abhorrence.[1] In another connection Paul designates the law a hand-writing that testified against us, which, at the death of Christ, was nailed with Him to the Cross, and thereby taken away.[2] The law of commandments and precepts is thus done away for believers;[3] no study of a mass of maxims and precepts often uncomprehended, often only capable of scientific application, is required of them; the letter of the written law, with its threats, its curse, and its anger, has no more dominion over them. But if the legal dispensation has ceased, if the law has no power to substitute life for death, that is, to infuse into sinful men the love of God, and give them strength to subdue their evil desires, and to fulfil the requirements of the law, then it is clear that no man can be made righteous by the law, and the works of the law.

The Jew was proud of what he was and did, proud of his descent, his birth-place, his temple, his sacrifice and ceremonies; proud of his legal works—all this was his righteousness, whereby he was perfect before God. Thus he held the rags of his poverty and nakedness for the purple robe of a righteousness, whose hem he never touched once. For all these things—sacrifice, washings, circumcision, sabbaths and the rest—could not put away

[1] Gal. iii. 13, 14. Deut. xxi. 23. He appeared as a curse before men, not with God, for to Him the death of Christ is a sweet odour ὀσμὴ εὐωδίας. Eph. v. 2. Paul has, therefore, purposely omitted the ὑπὸ θεοῦ of the Septuagint and Hebrew. [This, it will be remembered, is also the interpretation of the early Fathers.—Tr.]

[2] Col ii. 13, 14. [3] Eph. ii. 15.

sin, or give new moral powers, or make men righteous within. Therefore to all alike, without distinction or preference, Jews and Gentiles, justification through faith was preached, excluding all works of the law. Salvation by faith alone—that means, by God's grace alone. Thereby above all was man humbled, and reminded that nothing he could do of himself could please God. Not by the works of the law—that means, not by works done only in consequence of the law, and by merely legal knowledge and assistance. Paul excludes from justifying all the Jew did by virtue of the Mosaic covenant law, or the Gentile by the moral law, made known in conscience, though the work be a moral one in conformity to the letter of the law.

The apostle distinguishes constantly the righteousness of the law or its works, which is not a true one, and the righteousness of faith, which is, indeed, a righteousness of the law, in so far as by faith man has the mind which truly fulfils the law. God looks not at the act, but at the intention and bent of the will it proceeds from. By this He judges men; where He finds it, He declares men righteous before, as yet, it has shown itself in outward acts, or taken the shape of actual righteousness and observance of the law. Therefore to the word "justify" the apostle adds the expression of God "imputing righteousness" to man.[1] He recognizes in justification a moral judgment pronounced on the worthiness or unworthiness of the man, the worth or guilt of his will and deed. God imputes to man

[1] λογίζεσθαι Rom. iv. 3—6.

either sin or righteousness, whether generally, when his whole direction of will as devoted to God or revolting from Him is under divine judgment, or particularly, when some isolated act is brought under the divine judgment.[1] God reckons to man what He has imparted as a gift and man has appropriated, the indwelling might and principle of free obedience, as though it were already a full performance and perfected righteousness, which it only becomes by degrees. Thus a lustful gaze is reckoned as adultery, and hatred cherished in the heart as murder. And, as man is condemned before God for the mere intent and aim of the will as for an accomplished act, so faith is reckoned for righteousness to one not working but believing.[2]

The works which gradually appear as the fruits of this faith contain nothing not substantially contained in the faith; they are only a continuation and expansion of the germ wrapped up in it. The faith dynamically includes the works, whence Paul constantly speaks of the obedience of faith, and makes the righteousness of man simply a service of obedience.[3] Faith, the inward obedience, contains the outer obedience in germ. The notions of righteousness and justification are, therefore, obviously closely connected in Paul's mind. He uses the latter term for God's judgment on men: justified means with him declared just by God, but "the judg-

[1] Rom. iv.; 2 Tim. iv. 16.
[2] Matt. v. 28. 1 John iii. 15. Rom. iv. 4, 5.
[3] Rom. i. 5; vi. 16; xvi. 26.

ment of God is according to truth."[1] God only judges and declares him just who is such inwardly, for before God in Christ nought avails but faith working by love, a new creature, the observance of the divine commandments.[2] This is that gift of righteousness proceeding from the heart, and penetrating the whole life in all its powers and energies till it has fought its way to mastery, with whose entrance sin in man is crucified, or, in other words, dies in painful conflicts and sufferings. He who has this gift fulfils by evangelical grace the righteousness of the law, which the law could not do. Paul names it again the law of righteousness, which the Jews did not attain to, because they sought it in a perverse way, by the works of the law.[3] It is further in his view a new, creative, life-giving law, the law of the life of Christ, which opposes and dethrones in men the law of sin, not imperiously domineering from without, but passing into the will. Thence Paul calls it the "righteousness of God," or "from God," and opposes it to the righteousness of the law or our own, for this gift is something really dwelling in man, implanted by God. It springs originally from the grace of God, but immediately from the grace of the Man, Jesus Christ, and on receiving it all happiness depends.[4]

This indwelling principle or gift must, as Paul again and again reminds us, be raised to full dominion over

[1] Rom. ii. 2.
[2] Gal. v. 6; vi. 15. 1 Cor. vii. 19.
[3] δῶρον, δώρημα; Rom. v. 16, 17. Gal. v. 25. Rom. viii. 4; ix. 31.
[4] Rom. iii. 24; v. 15; x. 3. Phil. iii. 9.

all our faculties; we must "make our members, which before were instruments of sin, instruments of righteousness," and renouncing the service of sin pass, through obedience, to the service of righteousness.[1] Every man serves one of two masters; he is either a slave of sin or a servant of righteousness, that righteousness which, with peace and joy in the Holy Ghost, constitutes the kingdom of God, in which the new man is created after God, and whose fruits or reward God will increase, for it is imparted by God and kindred to Him; "He that doeth righteousness is righteous, as He is righteous."[2] That alone avails before God, and when Paul speaks of human righteousness as acceptable and well-pleasing to God, he reminds us that God works in us what is pleasing to Him, for that he alone is pleasing to God and approved to man who serves Christ in righteousness, peace, and joy, in the Holy Ghost.[3] That alone can counteract and subdue the principle of sin which has enslaved all men from Adam downwards, and made them wretched. The second Adam, the God-man, is powerful to cleanse and deliver, as the first was to corrupt and enslave. The one is the fountain of death, physical and moral, the Other of life. As by the Fall and its consequences man became a sinner, not by imputation merely, but inwardly and truly, and a principle of evil was imparted to the whole race, even so is the righteousness, which strictly corresponds as a remedy

[1] Rom. vi. 13—16.
[2] Ib. vi. 20. Eph. iv. 24. 2 Cor. ix. 10. 1 John iii. 7.
[3] Heb. xiii. 21. Rom. xiv. 18.

to the evil it is directed against, a condition wrought in men through an inward moral change. "By the obedience of One the many shall be made righteous."[1]

Christ appeared in the world to become the Second Adam and new Beginner of the human race. Adam and Christ are typically related as Heads of the old and new humanity. As Adam was of the earth earthy, and could only beget what was earthy, Christ our second Father is from heaven, and His seed is heavenly, though His body is not from Heaven but of the seed of David. But, as a new link in the chain of humanity, He is its spiritual Representative, realizing its true idea. He has become for it the quickening Spirit, giving heavenly life to men, and the life-stream that proceeds from Him can and shall overspread the whole race.[2] He said on the Cross, "It is finished," for, as the Representative Man, He had finished once for all what must gradually take effect in individuals in the course of the world's history. Therefore Paul says, that God has quickened with Christ those dead in sins, and made them sit in the heavenly world.[3] The sufferings and the glory of the Lord, His death and His resurrection, are alike the source of righteousness to man. Only he that is dead is justified from sin, as Paul says,[4] and this points to the necessity of completely dying to sin, after the example of Jesus and by the power of His death, to guard against the idea that a mere sentence of forgiveness

[1] Rom. v. 19, καταστα θήσονται, "constituted" Cf. 2 Pet. i. 8. James i. 8.
[2] 1 Cor. xv. 47. Rom. v. 14—21.
[3] Eph. ii. 5, 6.
[4] Rom. vi. 7.

without a real inward death to sin is meant. "We judge that if One died, all died,"—suffered death in and with Him.[1] Those alone who are dead to self-seeking and practice self-denial like the dying Christ, whose whole life is determined by love to Him, are Christians. The sufferings and misfortunes of the redeemed are inwardly united to the sufferings of Christ; communion with Christ implies communion with His Passion, suffering and dying with Him. The Christian's life is a being implanted in Christ through conformity to His death, which is realized in believers through profound and living contemplation.[2]

So, again, by the assimilative power which proceeds from the glorified Christ, the believer will be like Him as well in His life as in His death. The life of the Risen Christ is as mighty as His death. The whole process by which the true life of believers is perfected is both an effect and a copying of the Resurrection. Paul is very emphatic in making Christ's Resurrection the cause of our justification. "He was delivered for our sins, and raised for our justification."[3] Not simply because we are made righteous by faith, which depends on the resurrection, but because the risen and ascended Christ, by the powers that flow from His glorified Body as from an inexhaustible storehouse, is mighty to form Himself a body among men whose Head He is and to which believers belong as so many members drawing

[1] 2 Cor. v. 14.

[2] Gal. ii. 19. Rom. vi. 5—8.; viii. 17. 2 Tim. ii. 11.

[3] Rom. iv. 25.

spiritual life from Him. Thus Paul shows that where Christ's death is operative, by our dying to sin, His risen life must operate also, for Christ was raised that we might bear fruit to God. Were He not risen we were yet in our sins; but by His death while yet enemies we were reconciled, by His life redeemed, or justified.[1] In connection with this view Paul describes justification as a process of imparting life.[1] Life with him is that moral renovation going out from the risen and glorified Christ, by which man dies to sin, and the "law of the Spirit of life" enters into him in place of the law of sin and death. He calls that process "justification of life,"[2] whereby man, through inward renewal, is changed from the state of sin to that of life, for "the carnal mind is death, the spiritual mind is life." Such is the richness and overflowing fulness of divine grace towards us, that it has made us alive with Christ who were dead in sins, and has given us the presentiment and expectation of taking part in His heavenly glory, making us "reign in life" or clothing us with the royal robe of true righteousness; for life and righteousness are, in Paul's mind, coincident.[3]

It is the same thought differently applied, when justification is set forth by Paul as wrought in men by the Holy Spirit. In contrasting with the Old Testament ministry of death and condemnation that of the New Covenant, he calls the latter indifferently a "ministry

[1] Eph. iv. 15 sqq. v. 29—32. 1 Cor. xii. 12 sqq.; xv. 43 sqq. 17. 2 Cor. iii. 18.; iv. 10. Phil. iii. 21. Rom. vi 4, 5.; vii. 4.; v. 10.

[2] δικαίωσις ζωῆς, Rom. v. 18.

[3] Rom. viii. 2—6.; v. 17. Eph. ii. 4, 5.

of the Spirit," and "of righteousness," and gives as its result freedom and the communication of Christ's glory to believers, under whose abiding influence they shall be transformed into the likeness of Christ. And, again, it is the Holy Ghost with the name—the being and power—of Jesus, from whom believers obtain forgiveness, sanctification and righteousness. Justification is thus again set forth as a gift of grace conferred by the Holy Ghost, but won by Christ, of whose fulness we receive it, for it is the very work and office of the Holy Ghost to restore to the condition of God's children those who were estranged from Him by sin, and build them up by degrees to the "perfect man of God."[1] Thence the justification of man is in the apostle's eyes above all a manifestation of divine *power*. The Gospel—the message of God's kingdom and salvation therein to be obtained—is a "power of God," and because he was sure of the powerful working of this message on believers the apostle was not ashamed of it, as he says.[2] As contrasted with the Greek philosophical systems and the Jewish law, it is a power of God, the instrument of what only divine omnipotence can effect on man, namely, freedom from the yoke of sin and inward renewal, the powerful and operative medicine which never fails to heal the sick when received by faith.

But this power of the Gospel is most vividly expressed in the two leading facts of the Evangelical history, the Crucifixion and Resurrection of Christ. As the Gospel

[1] 2 Cor. iii. 8, 9, 17, 18. 1 Cor. vi. 11. John i. 16. 2 Tim. iii. 17.
[2] Rom. i. 16.

generally, so especially Christ crucified, to the Jews indeed a stumbling-block, and foolishness to the Gentiles, but to believers the power of God, is the instrument whereby the divine omnipotence and love makes men free from moral and spiritual slavery. And therefore, by faith in the death, or as Paul says shortly, the blood of Christ, man is made righteous. The apostle shows by his own example wherein this faith peculiarly consists, and what it does. He is so absorbed with all the powers of his thought and will into the death of Jesus, that he can say he is crucified with Christ, he does not so much live as Christ in Him, the world is crucified to Him, and He to the world.[1] His inward being was so possessed and ruled by this fact, so penetrated by the spirit of the crucified Lord, that the all-pervading aim to copy those virtues Christ showed on the Cross, and the fulness of the mind of Christ, overcame and killed every earthly desire and passion.

Thus, faith in the Lord's death and resurrection, quickened and confirmed in us by divine grace, becomes our righteousness. Of all events in human history, that death is adapted to make the deepest impression on every mind, and to exert the greatest power over the thoughts and feelings of men. In this sense, Jesus Himself had pointed to the type of the brazen serpent, by gazing on which the Israelites in the wilderness were healed of the bites of deadly serpents.[2] Thus He, too, was uplifted

[1] 1 Cor. i. 23. Rom. iii. 25. Gal. ii. 20. [It is a question whether ἐν τῷ αἵματι, Rom. iii. 25, does not go with ἱλαστήριον, rather than πίστεως. Cf. Vaughan *in loc. Ep. to Romans.* Macmillan.—Tr.]

[2] John iii. 14.

before the eyes of the world and of all coming generations, and, by looking on Him hanging on the Cross, the poison of sin—which is for the soul what the serpent's bite was for the body of the Israelites—was to be made harmless, and man's moral sickness healed. Distance of time and place does not affect it. The spiritual sight of the Crucified is as powerful to heal after eighteen centuries, the attraction of His sufferings and death is as great, as it was for Paul. This greatest act of self-devoted love, this abasement of the God-man, to our eyes immeasurable, includes all most capable by the laws of human nature to seize and stifle at birth the movements of fleshly lust, of worldliness, and of pride. In the clear light of His Passion, and while the pattern of His self-sacrifice and patient meekness is reproduced and preserved in our souls through the abiding influence of the Holy Ghost, all self-pleasing presumption appears a delusion, all pursuit of temporary pleasure a folly.

But the Lord's death will ever be closely bound up with His resurrection, and considered as completed in it; both being equally needed, and equally effective for our healing and justification. As the power of Jesus' death is to be mirrored in the Christian's life, so must it also be a continuous revelation of the power of His resurrection.[1] Christ in His exaltation and glorified Humanity, and by virtue of His relation to the Father and to man, is the Source of all power imparted to men through the Incarnation, and brings them to salvation by an energy flowing from His divine Manhood, piercing flesh and spirit. For He forms Himself a body from among men,

[1] Phil. iii. 10.

whose quickening Head He is; and all, who by faith and baptism are incorporated into that body, receive the gifts and powers which flow from Him as its Head; whence Paul makes justification consist specially in faith in His resurrection and exaltation.[1] Man believes in Christ when he comes into fellowship with Him, and is made partaker of His death and resurrection, by so dying to sin, that it has no more dominion over him, and by becoming a member of His body and sharer of the life He gives through regeneration and spiritual birth. When in this manner the principle of sin is cast out by the principle of righteousness, and the latter has become active and powerful in him, the divine judgment recognizing him as righteous is realised. This life-giving principle Paul calls the Spirit, and contrasts with the ministration of death and condemnation—the law—the ministration of the Spirit (of righteousness), as he ascribes our righteousness to the influences of the Spirit working in us, who writes the law in our hearts.[2]

Justification is so distributed among the Persons of the Trinity, that the Father from His eternal love has reconciled the world with Himself, the Son by His Incarnation has become the instrument of reconciliation, and lastly, the Source of our being made righteous, the Holy Ghost, sent forth from the Son, perfects justification in us actually. Therefore, Paul represents Christ's appearance on earth and the existence of the Christian

[1] Eph. iv. 15 sqq.; v. 29—32. 1 Cor. xii. 14. Col. ii. 19. Rom. iv. 24; x. 9.

[2] 2 Cor. iii. 7 sqq.

Church as a great revelation of divine righteousness at the present time.[1] In former ages, God's attitude towards human sin had rather manifested His long-suffering and mercy than His righteousness, that is His holiness, in relation to man. He had connived at men's sins and passed them over;[2] thereby, and from the moral state of His chosen people, His holiness was darkened in the eyes of many. The heavy and continuous sins of Israel had caused His name to be dishonoured among the Heathen, as though He were not a holy and righteous God. Thence that remarkable prophecy, "I will sanctify My great name, which is profaned among the Heathen, which ye have profaned in the midst of them; and the Heathen shall know that I am the Lord. And I will give you a new heart, and a new spirit I will put within you; and I will take away the stony heart from your flesh, and will give you an heart of flesh. And I will put my spirit within you, and will make you to walk in my precepts, and to keep my judgments and do them."[3] The later revelation of His righteousness, then, consisted in substituting for the mere passing over (πάρεσις), the forgiveness (ἄφεσις), of sins, with inward renewal of men, for the proper efficacy of the blood shed for remission of sins is shown in cleansing from sin. The righteousness of God was further revealed in that now, first, the utterance of His holy will to man in the law was rightly established, and its right internal fulfilment made possible to him by the powers and means of grace flowing from the work

[1] Rom. i. 17. [2] πάρεσις. Rom. iii. 25. Ezek. xxxvi. 23—27.

of redemption, and thus God declared the Heathen righteous who before were unrighteous, because He also made them righteous.[1]

Paul comprises under the idea of faith the two factors of human righteousness,—the gift and operation of the Holy Ghost in men, and their corresponding action in receiving and appropriating it. God offers righteousness to man; he appropriates it by faith, and the form it takes in him Paul calls faith. Thus man is righteous by faith, and His righteousness is nothing else than faith. For faith is the vessel which contains God's gifts, the instrument the Holy Ghost works with. This faith, whose beginning and need lies in the common desire of man for the satisfaction of his being by God, is in its essence, on one side self-devotion to God, on the other a

[1] 1 John i. 7. Heb. ix. 13, 14. Rom. iii. 31; iv. 5. δικαιοῦντα τὸν ἀσεβῆ. From the beginning of Jewish Hellenism ἀσεβὴς is the regular expression for Heathen, as εὐσεβὴς for Jews. So Josephus, Philo, the Sibylline books Cf. 1 Maccabees iii. 15; ix. 73. In writing to the Roman Jews whom he had never seen, Paul could not have used the word—which only occurs three times at all in his Epistles—in any other than the usual sense; no Jew could have understood it of himself and his countrymen, who, before becoming Christians, were pious Jews. In Rom. v. 6 again, ὄντων ἡμῶν ἀσθενῶν refers to the Jews, as ἡμῶν shows while ὑπὲρ ἀσεβῶν refers to the Gentiles. Paul could not in the same breath call men ἀσθενεῖς and ἀσεβεῖς, the latter signifying in common acceptation godless, or betrayers of God. The ἀσθενεῖς are weak persons, who, before they were Christians, lacked the power of the Spirit to co-operate with a good will, and the requirements of the law. Between the ἀσθενὴς and ἀσεβὴς is a great gulf, but Paul says, that Christ died for both Jew and Gentile. There is a further reference in his language to Abraham's former idolatry, recorded by Jewish tradition, as Grotius has observed. [διὰ χειρῶν ἀνόμων Acts ii. 23, is similarly a reference to the *Gentile* executioners of Christ.—Tr.]

seizing and appropriating of what He offers in Christ, which can only be received and possessed by such an act of self-surrender. It is not an isolated act of human knowledge, feeling, or will, but a complex action, something only consummated through the co-operation of all the powers of the soul. Hope, love, fear, trust, humility, obedience, steadfastness, and zeal—all are comprised in justifying faith. But, above all, it is a state of soul wrought by God, who first brings light out of darkness, harmony out of confusion, in the heart of man, and then blesses His work as He blessed the world at its creation.

Above all, the faith whereby man is justified, means with Paul the receptivity of man, his willing self-surrender to divine truths and influences. Man lives a new life in and by faith; Christians firmly and immovably grounded in faith and hope are holy, blameless, and unreprovable before God; elsewhere Paul ascribes to love this being "firmly grounded and rooted," and to faith Christ's indwelling in our hearts, for only faith working by love avails with Christ and makes just.[1] Where the apostle describes more accurately justifying faith in Christ, it is especially the obedience whereby He gave up His life as an atoning sacrifice, His blood or death, and His resurrection, which are named as the objects of this faith. It is these facts, intensely realized by faith, that make the strongest and most lasting impression on the heart of man, changing its whole inward being. He cannot take in the full significance of the death of Jesus, without at the same time recognizing the true character

[1] Gal. ii. 20; v. 6. Col. i. 22. Eph. iii. 17.

of sin, hating and dying to it; he cannot contemplate the resurrection, without being raised to a new life. What Christ did and suffered, becomes the great motive power of our whole life. That is justification by faith, and thus "grace reigns through righteousness," the righteousness whose servants we are to be, and our members its instruments. Here grace is not merely a manifestation of divine favour, but also a divine power, the imparting of a gift; the grace that trains us to a godly and righteous life, and the denial of all worldly desires. Thus "Christ is become to us Wisdom from God, Righteousness, Sanctification, and Redemption," as being the Type and Source of all this.[1]

Paul and the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews adduce as patterns of righteousness gained by faith two men, Noah and Abraham. The former built the ark believing the divine intimation about the approaching judgment of the Flood, and the deliverance of himself and his family, and thus "became heir of the righteousness by faith." The faith of the latter in the divine promise of an heir of his body, and a seed like the stars of heaven for multitude, was counted for righteousness. Wherein then lay the justifying power of this faith in Noah and Abraham? In its moral application; "Abraham was not weak in faith," and though old, and with body now dead, doubted not, but believed firmly, that the promise would be fulfilled. This faith was anew counted to him for righteousness, when long before he had become righteous before God, through his act of

[1] Rom. v. 21; vi. 4, 5, 16, 19. Tit. ii. 11, 12. 1 Cor. i. 30.

believing obedience in leaving his home at the call of God. The apostle recognizes in his faith a mind resting wholly upon God, involving an entire and willing submission to every manifestation of the divine will; and thus he deduces from faith, as a state of soul which makes the future present and the invisible visible, all that was good and great in the men of the Old Covenant and their whole condition before God.[1] Faith in Christ, which now alone justifies, is only a higher degree of the same quality. If the fathers showed their strength of faith by hoping against hope, and believing firmly, and trusting against all contrary appearances, that same energy and firmness of faith is now claimed in a higher degree; for, veiled under the form of a slave and a carpenter's son, dead upon the Cross, the Christian must acknowledge his Lord and Redeemer, and that acknowledgment cannot be separated from the idea and resolution of, in a certain sense, undergoing the same process of suffering and death. While, then, man believes unto righteousness, or is made righteous by faith, he thereby makes the strongest and most decisive use possible of his freedom; he humbly accepts the sentence which declares him a sinner, without power of his own, and then forgives him; he renounces all righteousness of his own and all attempts after it; he confesses that righteousness is only with God, and from Him alone can be received; he completely abandons himself to the will and devotes his life to the service of God. And thus

[1] Rom. iv. 19—21. Heb. xi.

faith contains the whole energy of a will directed upon God and Christ.

Paul means by faith, what Christ meant when He ascribed its absence in the Jews to their vain seeking after honour, and their hearts being without love of God.[1] As the faith Christ requires is a moral habit of mind, perfectly pure and free from all self-seeking, so is that faith which, according to the apostle, God reckons for righteousness. Man, indeed, is made righteous by faith, without the works of the law, but this doctrine, as Paul says, does not abolish but establish the righteousness of the law. For this faith is a ruling principle which originates or determines every human act, the righteousness implanted by God as an actual living quality, the law of life of the Spirit taking the place of that sin which reigned before; and by virtue of it the requirements of the law are really fulfilled in man and by him. For, therefore, righteousness comes not by the law, because the law cannot make alive, or give power to fulfil its precepts.[2] That only the Crucified and risen Christ can do through faith in Him; He has done what the law could not, by becoming for all the Source of life; but only those are justified before God in whom the mind that fulfils the law really rules, that is, faith working by love, for love is the fulfilling of the law.[3] Thus the Gospel is a new revelation of the righteousness and the grace of God; of righteousness, because now the sinner really leads a righteous life by

[1] John v. 41, 44.
[2] Rom. iii. 31; viii. 4. Gal. iii. 21.
[3] Rom. viii. 3; xiii. 10.

faith, and gives proof of the divine righteousness truly imparted to men; of grace, in so far as this is a free gift of God, unmerited and not dependent on previous works. For that man can only be saved by faith, means that it is a gift of undeserved grace. This doctrine humbles man by reminding him that of himself he can do nothing pleasing to God, and must receive all from God. It also exhibits in its true light the holiness of God, as not satisfied with this or that outward work, or a mechanical service, but requiring in and with faith the whole mind of man, the complete surrender of His spirit.

All, then, in Paul's sense is given freely and of grace. As God forgives man's sins, so He cleanses and sanctifies their hearts, by faith. Neither our absolution from sin nor our sanctification is by works. For it is a contradiction for a thing to be of works, and of grace. What is given by works is given by obligation or merit. And Paul calls the whole Christian religion "faith," as generally in the New Testament Christianity is named "faith," as distinguished from Judaism and Heathenism. "Now that faith is come we are no more under a schoolmaster," as Paul says;[1] and he speaks of the faith first to be revealed, and introduced as a religious institution into the world, when the time of training under the law was run out. Faith and believers existed before Christ, but faith then was not this new system, this divine economy and order, where faith is one and all, and includes everything peculiarly Christian. Thus faith and the law

[1] Rom. xi. 6; iv. 4, x. 8; i. 5. Acts vi. 7; xiii. 8. Gal. iii. 23—25. [There is no English equivalent for παιδαγωγὸς.—Tr.]

are contrasted by Paul as the two parts or halves of the order chosen by God. Man must become righteous by faith, and not by the law; that means, that no one can henceforth become truly righteous and pleasing to God as a Jew, but only as a Christian, for the law is fulfilled in Christ, and all the higher gifts are now bestowed only in the Christian Church. "The law was given by Moses, grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." Israel, the mass of the nation, followed after a law of righteousness and attained it not, because they sought it by works and not by faith. Their end was right, for they wished to become really holy and righteous, but their means were wrong. But the converted Gentiles have attained this end of righteousness by the grace of the Gospel, so that now the righteousness of the law is fulfilled in them, and they walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.[1]

Paul distinguishes a false and true righteousness. He had a righteousness of the law himself before his conversion, proceeding from the law and conformed to it; and perfected in legal works through the purely human medium of an unassisted will. He was blameless after the law; man's judgment could lay nothing to his charge. But the law cannot make alive, and the works that proceed from it are dead and worthless. Therefore he accounts all this dung, and strives after a better righteousness, flowing from God and His imparted power, which is faith,—an experience of the power of His resurrection, a share in His sufferings, and conformity to His death.

[1] John i. 17. Rom. ix. 31, 32; viii. 4. Phil. iii. 7—11.

The legal spirit of contemporary Judaism was the great opponent Paul had constantly to fight against, as Christ had before denounced it in the Pharisees. Paul knew it well, that self-righteousness, which, having no love, has no moral standard; the legal spirit, which makes every thing written of equal weight and obligation, since all rests on positive law, and puts arbitrary ritual ordinances before the eternal laws of morality. He knew them well, those strict legalists, how they took the bare letter for their motive and rule of action, how they strove to square accounts with that letter most pleasantly in their selfish hypocrisy, and were skilful in substituting for God's will their own inclination, in its interpretation.

Therefore Paul preached so energetically the abolition of "the law of commandments in ordinances," but he declares, at the same time, that the law is not abolished, but confirmed, by the doctrine of righteousness through faith, which replaces a mere outward and literal by an inward observance of it. The law itself is originally good and spiritual, given for life and not for death; it is only done away with in so far as it had become a letter that killeth. As a law of the Spirit it continues, and in the very Epistle where he is so intent on showing that man is justified by faith, and not by the works of the law, the apostle yet declares emphatically, that the doers of the law, not the hearers, shall be justified.[1] He recognises a law whose works always justify, because they spring from a believing mind, and grow as fruits of love; and a righteousness which excludes the works of the law,

[1] Eph. ii. 15. Rom. vii. 10, 12; ii. 12.

and yet cannot be conceived without works,—the works of love fulfilling the law.

There is, then, a law of Christ which as King and supreme Legislator He has prescribed for His Church; that is the law of faith, the law of the life-giving Spirit, which brings with it the power to fulfil its requirements, and, unlike the Mosaic law on tables of stone, is written in the minds and hearts of men; what James calls the perfect law of freedom. By that law Paul declares himself bound, though free from the law of the Old Covenant; they fulfil it who bear one another's burdens. John says the commandments of Christ are not grievous, to him, that is, who loves God; for the whole law has regard to Christ, it is obedience and love.[1] If love were made perfect, and the flesh strove not continually against the spirit, God's will and ours would be one, duty and pleasure would always coincide. But that perfection is an ideal in this life never fully reached, though always to be aimed at.

In Christ and His Kingdom there is no contradiction, no partition wall between law and Gospel. The Gospel has a legal side, for its promises are conditional on the observance of divine obligatory commands with the sanction of reward and punishment. The law of Christ, again, is wholly evangelical, for all it requires it also gives power to fulfil; it passes, as the love of God, into our will, embracing and satisfying the whole range of human duties. Paul always emphatically excludes

[1] Rom. iii. 27; viii. 2. Heb. viii. 10. James i. 25. 1 Cor. ix. 21. Gal. vi. 2. 1 John v. 3..

the works of the law, or, as he often says shortly, works, from all part in justifying or saving men, but he means first the works of the Mosaic law, and next all merely natural and human works springing from the unaided will. He contrasts grace and works as mutually destructive. Not he who works (in legal observances) is justified, but he who believes; God pronounces him just who before was estranged as a Gentile, when he believes. Abraham, like Paul himself, might have praise of men for his works done after the flesh (before faith and without grace;) with God they had none. Not by the law, but the righteousness of faith, Abraham won the great promise, that in him and his seed all believing humanity should be incorporated, and his spiritual children go forth to inherit the world. By the righteousness of faith Paul here understands that greatest act of Abraham springing from unshaken faith and obedience, the giving up his only son.[1]

The righteousness of faith, then, consists in works, but they are not legal works, even though corresponding to the requirements of the law, but works of faith and grace. Paul describes it as the inward and spiritual circumcision of the heart wrought by Christ through His Spirit, the moral purification and renewal of man, the new creature. To such works Paul ascribes what he denies to works of the law, he makes them indispensable for justification; by them God's commandments are fulfilled, and that fulfilment, not circumcision, avails before Him; in them faith working by love operates,

[1] Rom. xi. 6.; iv. 1, 2, 5 (τὸν ἀσεβῆ) 13. Gen. xxii. 16—18.

and to such faith all is attributed; they have praise with God, the works of the law with men. Only those who bring forth such works are the true doers of the law, who are justified.[1] It does not occur to him who has done such works to boast of them, for he has not done them in his own strength, but received strength for it, for what is good in them comes from God. And, therefore, justification and sanctification or righteousness and holiness are substantially the same condition, only viewed from different sides, or according to its higher or lower stage of development. Holiness is righteousness, considered in reference to its acceptableness to God and His judgment upon it. Paul only once mentions being sanctified in connection with being justified, and there he puts it first; elsewhere, in reckoning up the links in the chain of salvation or order of the gifts of grace through which God leads men to eternal glory, he places glorification immediately after justification, without any mention of sanctification.[2]

The transition from Judaism or Heathenism into the Christian Church Paul generally designates a "being delivered," understanding thereby the change from a state of misery and corruption to one where salvation could be attained. All Christians are "delivered." To be justified and delivered is the same thing, only the former term indicates the condition in relation to God's judgment, the latter in relation to the position and views of men. And so Paul, in speaking of deliverance,

[1] Col. ii. 11. Phil. iii. 2. Rom. ii. 29, 13. 1 Cor. vii. 19. Gal. v. 6.
[2] 1 Cor. vi. 11. Rom. viii. 30.

opposes grace and works, namely, works done of one's own will and pleasure, which are not fruits of grace and which one may be tempted to boast of, and, again, works and good works. "By grace ye have been saved through faith, and this not of yourselves; it is the gift of God; not of works, that none should boast. For we are His workmanship created in Christ Jesus to do good works, which God has prepared that we should walk in them."[1] That is a gift of God, first, the re-creation of man which enables him instead of works valueless before God to do works well pleasing to Him; next, that He has prepared all needful to that end for us, so that we lack nothing on His part for the continual performance of good works. But works that have no bearing on our salvation precede our re-creation or new birth. Still more clearly it is said in the Epistle to Titus, "When the goodness of God our Saviour and His love toward man appeared, not from works of righteousness we had done, but according to His own mercy, He saved us, by the laver of regeneration and renewal of the Holy Ghost, whom He poured out upon us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour, that, being justified by His grace, we might be made heirs in hope of eternal life."[2] Here we have a short account of the whole method of salvation—baptism, communication of the Holy Ghost, renewal by Him or sanctification, and with it passing into the state of salvation,—justification, and heirship of eternal life. Justification is the aim and effect of the inward renewal of the Spirit which cleanses and sanctifies. God first

[1] Eph. ii. 8—10. [2] Tit. iii. 4—7. Cf. 2 Tim. i. 9.

makes man just by re-creation or new birth, and then declares him just; but all that is grace, not merit of our previous works. Works done in the living condition of righteousness—and such alone are meritorious—we simply had none, for we were in no condition to perform them. And thus Paul teaches that we are sanctified without works of the law, as we are justified without them.

It is clear that, in contrasting faith as that which alone justifies with the law and its works, the apostle indicates by this term the whole process of man's conversion and reconciliation with God, as, under the co-operation of divine grace and human freedom, he comprises the separate points of repentance, conversion, trust, hope, and love. Man cannot make a beginning of his own conversion; the grace of God must first call him with a "holy calling," which naturally enough often remains ineffectual through his sin and hardness of heart. Where it takes effect, it first produces enlightenment in the hitherto darkened and variously deluded soul of man; grace opens his eyes and heart, awakens him, and brings him to himself. With the keener intuition of grace he recognises the holiness of God, the nature of sin, and his own sinfulness; and is convinced by the message of the Redeemer, His works, His offers, and His promises, that there is a sure remedy for his ailment, strength for his frailty, deliverance from an otherwise inevitable destruction.[1]

[1] 2 Tim. i. 9. Acts xiii. 46 sqq.; xxiv. 25; xxvi. 18; xvi. 14. Heb. iv. 7. Eph. v. 14. Rom. iii. 20. Tit. i. 2.

But man not only can at the beginning resist this knowledge, and the cleansing and transforming power it exerts over his will; he can continue to do so even after he has in some degree opened his heart to it; he can contest every step of its onward march in his soul, so that knowledge already gained may by his fault become dead and unfruitful. In a word, he may be enlightened and yet remain unconverted. But in so far as he admits the transforming influence of the truths of salvation on his feelings and his will, his knowledge, too, will be increased, purified, and strengthened. In proportion, too, as he discovers and recognises in the mirror of evangelical doctrine and of the pattern of Jesus the depth of his fall, the extent of his departure from these requirements and models, the contradiction between what he is and what he ought to be, and the impotence of his will to bridge over the chasm, there arises in him a sense of shame and displeasure at his state. Hatred of sin, desire for pardon, restored communion with God, and freedom from the yoke of sin, and a resolution to renounce its service, succeed.[1] It is faith in the Redeemer and His already accomplished reconciliation of man with God which prevents these feelings of remorse from leading to despondency, demoralisation, and despair. This faith takes the form of trust. He is confident that the act of Christ has broken Satan's power, and opened to him, as to all men, an approach to God; in spite of all sense of personal unworthiness he trusts the omnipotence, truth, and goodness of God, who will verify His

[1] 2 Cor. vii. 8—11.

promises, and secure to him the aid of grace to obey His laws; he is confident that the atoning and sanctifying power of the sufferings, death, and resurrection of Christ will be manifested in him also, that to him also his ascended Lord will impart, through His Holy Spirit, the fulness of His gifts and powers, unless by his own fault he rejects those gifts.

When he perceives how God first loved us, who were sinners and alienated from Him, and gave in the death of His Son the supreme evidence of that love, and when he is absorbed in contemplation of that undeserved kindness and love, that grace so ready to give and to forgive, a corresponding love is kindled in his heart; and thereby faith is perfected. To live by faith, means simply to love by faith, and in that love to obey and suffer. "Faith working by love" is the shortest summary of all Christianity.[1] The rays of divine love concentrated in Christ, as in a focus, kindle in men's hearts, through faith in Him, love to God as the absolutely Holy One, our Father and Saviour. The soul laden with guilt cannot love a holy and righteous God who hates sin, but it can love a loving, reconciled God, ready to forgive and offering the fulness of His gifts,—in a word, God revealed in Christ. Only in and with this love is there an earnest acceptance of the divine promises and gifts, which necessarily implies a proportionate use of them. And this acceptance is, at once, a full and unconditional self-surrender to Christ, and a free and willing obedience and zeal to keep His commandments. This is the process of man's conversion.

[1] 1 John iv. 19. Rom. v. 6, 8. 1 Pet. i. 20. Gal. v. 6.

When he has got so far, and before the inward transformation has yet been shown in outward acts, he can look on himself as in the grace of God or justified, notwithstanding the sin which yet clings to him, but no longer rules him, for it is overcome in principle by penitence and love; his sins are forgiven him, he is already renewed and "created for good works."

In justification are included and indivisibly bound together forgiveness of sin—acquittal, that is, from the condemnation of God—and actual making righteous. Forgiveness of sin is never separated from subjugation of sin, for to forgive is to remove the penalty of sin, and its worst penalty is its dominant power, and the enmity with God which that implies. That, in itself, is already Hell in the breast of man. Sin is its own punishment, and only by destroying it can its punishment be taken away. Hence, forgiveness of sins is sometimes used to express the whole blessing of the Gospel, which consists in putting away the chief effects of sin—spiritual death or separation of the soul from God—and therefore, in restoring spiritual life and re-uniting the soul with God. And thus, while Paul always looks on the Christians to whom he writes as already justified, he yet speaks of righteousness as something future, an object of hope, which he and they must strive after, because it is not something settled and done with, once for all, but, in some sense, to be always won and worked at anew,—the being holy and the pleasing God.[1] And he adds, that only faith working by love avails, a developing, ever-

[1] Gal. ii. 17; v. 5.

growing, and therefore, in part, only hoped-for righteousness.

Conversion, which is the decisive turning point in man's life, is the beginning of an advancing renewal and transformation from the innermost mind and spirit, the spirit's entrance on a struggle for its proper lordship over the flesh and the lower motions, and on a continuous process of effacing the remnants of the old dominion of sin, in which man makes all the occurrences of life minister to an increased purity and holiness. All depends on his not withdrawing himself from the influence of divine grace. By virtue of the mediatorial office between God and man, predestined from all eternity to the Son, all divine love and grace is given only in Him and through Him.[1] But the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Crucified and Risen Son, and imparts to men, as the principle of a new life, the true power to abolish sin, and forms in them a godly life. For man cannot of himself turn to God, with his moral powers weakened and disordered by the common sinfulness of the race, and his own personal sins superadded: the grace of God must prevent him. As Christ said to His disciples, "Without me ye can do nothing," so Paul says, that no man can call Christ Lord, and enter into communion with Him, but by the Holy Ghost. The operations and gifts of the Holy Ghost, which are variously imparted as it pleases God in His wisdom, embrace the whole course of conversion and sanctification. God works in us both to will and to do, the power of acting, and therefore we must work out our salvation with fear and

[1] 2 Tim. i. 9.

trembling, for we are able to resist the action of His grace and make it void. Faith, repentance, hope, love—all these are "fruits of the Spirit," who cleanses and enlightens us within, our feelings, understanding, will; in short, all that concerns Christian life, its commencement, development, growth, and consummation, is referred back to God or the Holy Ghost as its Author.[1] Therefore, Paul calls man's body the temple of the Holy Ghost, because the soul that dwells in that bodily tabernacle is the theatre and object of His operations and gifts.

And hence, when believers fulfil God's law, it is not their own work, but His work in them; for the Spirit who sets them free from the law of sin and death puts another law in its place,—His own power and law of life in Christ. But His power does not act forcibly, with physical and irresistible determination of the will; man can and must in each case either yield to it or shut it out, accept or reject it. But the gift of the divine Spirit already received, the power which enables us to fulfil God's commandments, the shedding forth of His love in our hearts, the consciousness of being heirs by hope of eternal life—all this assures the Christian that he already has part in the love of God, and is in real communion with Christ.[2] As the apostle words it, the Spirit is the Seal and Pledge in our hearts of the firmness of His covenant, the truth and certainty of His promises.

By security, by want of watchfulness, by lazy neglect

[1] John xv. 5. 1 Cor. xii. 3. Heb. ii. 4. Phil. iii. 12, 13; i. 6. Gal. v. 22. 2 Pet. i. 3. Rom. xv. 15. 2 Tim. ii. 15.

[2] Eph. ii. 8—10. Rom. viii. 2; v. 5. Heb. iii. 12, 13. Tit. iii. 7. 1 John iii. 23, 24. 2 Cor. i. 21, 22.

of offered graces, and helps for Christian advance and strengthening, the regenerate may fall back into his former sinful condition, and even under the full dominion of sin; and then a second conversion is harder than the first. Hence, the apostle's vigorous warning against a complete hardening of the heart: "their last state is worse than the first, it were better never to have known the way of righteousness." The Epistle to the Hebrews speaks of a falling away connected with the unpardonable sin against the Holy Ghost, or identical with it, and leaving no further possibility for conversion.[1] This has immediate reference to certain unstable Jewish converts who had been highly favoured in not only receiving faith, but also the miraculous spiritual gifts of that period, and had become living members of the mystical body of Christ; when such persons utterly fall away, and revile as a lie and delusion the operations of the Holy Ghost they have themselves experienced, and even go so far as to blaspheme Christ, they naturally sink into a condition of judicial blindness and hardness, from which there is no further deliverance.

The whole life of a believer, shaped and ruled by grace, consists of a series of separate acts, which, as the common product of grace and the human will, as "good works" and a fulfilment of God's commandments, have high promises. Such works proceed from the heart, wherein dwells faith working by love. Christ Himself had connected the abiding in His love and enjoying His friendship with the keeping of God's commandments. So the apostles say, love is the fulfilling of the law; His

[1] 2 Pet. ii. 20—22. Heb. vi. 4—8.

commandments are not grievous; he that says he knows Christ, and keeps not His commandments, is a liar; God has prepared us to walk in good works, to be rich in them, and thereby lay a foundation of future blessedness, which Christ has promised as their reward. They are fruits of the Spirit, ascribed to God as their Author; the power comes from Him, and without Him we can do nothing. Yet the believer who produces them by grace as His instrument co-operates in their goodness, whereby they are an object of His complacency and ground of His promised recompense, and is "a good and faithful servant," in his patient well doing, a vessel fitted for every good work and worthy of honour, deserving the happiness of the glorious and perfect kingdom. These shall walk with Christ in white raiment, "for they are worthy;" and Paul, when looking back on the good fight he had fought, and the fidelity he had kept, could say that his reward was already prepared for him, the crown of righteousness which the Lord the righteous Judge should repay to him in that day, nor only to him, but to all who await His return in love. For eternal happiness is a blessing conditioned on a life of faith fruitful in good works, and therefore a reward, pre-supposing the moral capacity of the receiver, that is, his merit. But this very moral capacity, this treasure of good works, is a gracious gift of God, merited by Christ, as He also merited for us that our works should deserve increase and advance of grace in this life, and the crown of glory in the life to come, that they should be capable of reward.[1]

If Paul combated that perverse confidence in the

[1] John xv. 10, 15, 4, 5. Rom. xiii. 10. 1 John v. 3; ii. 4. Eph.

Mosaic law, which sought righteousness and salvation only in its observance, and not in believing self-surrender to Christ, James, at a somewhat later period, had to contend against an apparently opposite error, but really springing out of the same root,—the error of those who thought to be righteous before God by faith alone. This notion appeared under various forms among Jews, Christians, and heretics. John, also, had to warn against false teachers, who preached a righteousness of mere faith, and was obliged to insist that only he is righteous who does righteousness; that real Christian righteousness, is a complete, moral, new birth of man.[1] In fact, Simon Magus and his adherents taught that men obtained salvation only by grace—by faith, or believing knowledge, *gnosis*,—and not by good works.[2] There were those among the Jews in Justin's time who said, that if they were sinners their sins, in consideration of their knowledge of the true God, would not be imputed to them; and the Judaizing Gnostics, whose views are given in the Clementines, held that "monarchical" souls (*i.e.*, those believing in One God) had this advantage over the Heathen, that even if they led vicious lives they could not be lost, but would at last attain happiness after a purifying punishment.[3]

James and Paul connect with the word, "justification," the same idea, viz., of being found and declared

ii. 10. 1 Tim. vi. 18 sqq. Matt. xvi. 27; xxv. 21. 1 Cor. iv. 7. 2 Tim. ii. 15, 21; iv. 8. 2 Thess. i. 5. Luke xx. 35. Apoc. iii. 4. Phil. ii. 13.

[1] 1 John ii. 29; iii. 7 sqq.

[2] Iren. v. 20. Theodoret. *Hær. Fab.* i. 1.

[3] Just. *Dial c. Tryph.* 141. Clem. *Hom.* iii. 6.

just in God's judgment on the human mind, which further implies being children of God and heirs of eternal blessedness. At first sight, they seem to contradict each other, for Paul says, man becomes righteous by faith without works of the law, while James says, man becomes righteous by works and not by faith alone.[1] But the difference is only a seeming one. James teaches that two factors must combine in man's justification, his faith and his works, meaning such works as are only produced by faith. By these works justifying faith first reaches its true form, and displays itself in its full truth and reality. Without works it is indeed faith, but a dead, not a living faith, as being without that life consisting in good works, which alone has decisive worth before God. In these works it is perfected. Abraham's example shows how faith and works are necessary and inseparable in justification, neither availing without the other. And thus the very example Paul relies on for excluding dead works of the law from justification is used by James against an unfruitful and unworking faith. He quotes Abraham's last and most decisive work of faith, the giving up his son Isaac as a sacrifice. It was only when Abraham's faith was thus conspicuously proved, as an unshaken trust in God's promises and unconditional obedience, that, in the words of Scripture, his faith was counted to him for righteousness, and he was called a friend of God.[2]

Thus did James combat a new Pharisaism rising in the bosom of the early Church, proud of its pure and

[1] Rom. iii. 28. James ii. 24.

[2] James ii. 13—26.

professedly blameless faith, and dispensing itself from troublesome works. When he makes works necessary for justification, and Paul excludes them, they do but supplement and explain each other. Paul means works of the law done in the flesh; he never calls them "good works," but rather distinguishes works, or works of the law, from "good works," and is always careful to add the epithet good, when not speaking of works of the law, which he calls simply "works."[1] He means works where the mere outward act, and not the principle or motive, is the thing considered, done indeed from obedience to a command, but from a selfish, blind, slavish obedience; works, again, which the unenlightened man left to himself does from his own natural powers, and so he impresses on the Gentile Christians at Ephesus, that they owe their deliverance and state of salvation, not to their works—those done before conversion—but to the gift of God, that they must first be created in Christ unto good works, and the Holy Ghost be implanted in them as a principle of life. And such works alone justify, according to James, works of a law by which we shall be judged, a law of liberty entering and penetrating man's inmost soul, not simply giving external commands, but eliciting a free and spontaneous obedience, through its accompanying power to give life. It is what Paul calls the law of the life-giving Spirit in Christ, which has freed him from the law of sin and death. The truth which

[1] 2 Cor. ix. 8. Eph. ii. 10. Col. i. 10. 2 Thess. ii. 17. 1 Tim. ii. 10; v. 10, 25; vi. 18. 2 Tim. ii. 21; iii. 17. Tit. i. 16; ii. 7, 14; iii. 8, 14; Heb. x. 24; xiii. 21.

James speaks out, that justifying faith must be completed and made perfect by works, Paul clothes in this form,—that if he had all, the very strongest, faith, and had not love, he would be nothing, therefore not righteous before God. In the same sense, he makes love greater and more precious than faith, attaching salvation and righteousness in a higher degree to love than to faith. For, as James says, faith is first perfected through love, or the works of love, so as to justify.[1]

If it is now clear how entirely the apostles are agreed in their account of the conversion, justification, and glorification of man, they are equally at one in affirming that none are excluded from this scheme of salvation, that grace is even more abounding than human sinfulness. Paul asserts distinctly the *universality of redemption.* God wills all men to be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth; He wills to have mercy on all. The salvation proceeding from Christ as the Second Adam, and offered by Him, is as all-embracing as the sinfulness of the first Adam. Christ has made atonement for the whole world, as John says. If all do not actually attain the blessing, it is their own fault; there is no defect or limit on God's side; His whole dispensation for the fallen race is one of mercy. When the New

[1] Eph. ii. 9, 10. James i. 25; ii. 12. Rom viii. 2. 1 Cor. xiii. 2, 13. The last attempt at a distinction (Huther *Exeget. Handbuch über den Brief Jacobi*, p. 130), to the effect that James speaks of a different justification from Paul, viz., only of a later one in the last judgment, while Paul is dealing with man's first entrance into the state of grace, is groundless. James understands δικαιωθῆναι as synonymous with φίλον θεοῦ κληθῆναι, or λογίζεσθαι εἰς δικαιοσύνην; he clearly knows of no justification by faith *alone*.

Testament writers look up from the act of redemption fulfilled in time to its Author, who first determined, and then carried it out, they speak of the eternal counsel of God before time was. The Lamb is slain from eternity. God chose us out before the foundation of the world, to be holy and blameless before Him.[1] That does not refer so much to the destiny of individuals, as the objects of a special determination of God, as to the work of redemption, and the institution of the Church as a whole. It is that of the calling of the Gentiles into the Church, which is the mystery predestined from the beginning of time and of the world's history, but kept secret with God, and now brought to its accomplishment.[2]

When God chose out a people for Himself, as the bearers and organs of His preparatory Messianic dispensation, neither their fathers nor their descendants had done good or evil, and their election could not have depended on their deserts. But God foresaw in their fathers, Jacob and Esau, the characteristic dispositions of the two peoples who should spring from them, the Israelites and Edomites, and therefore He "loved Jacob and hated Esau," that is, He chose not Esau and his people for the instruments of His plan of salvation. God hates nothing that He has made, for God is Love.[3]

How even the rejection of the Gospel by the multitude of the Jews falls into God's designs for the religious guidance of mankind, and must promote the salvation of men and the glory of God, Paul shows by the example of Pharaoh, who was only hardened by all divine com-

[1] Rom. v. 21, 18; xi. 32. 1 Tim. ii. 4. 1 John ii. 2. Eph. i. 4; iii. 9.
[2] Rom. xvi. 25. [3] Wisdom ii. 24.

mands and warnings, and yet with this obstinacy of a perverted will was but an instrument in the hand of God, to proclaim God's glory against His own will, and confirm the feeble confidence of Israel. If the apostle uses the expression, "God hardens," this is only in his energetic way of speaking, to refer the result of those dispensations through which Pharaoh's pride advanced immediately to God, without noticing any secondary causes. In the Old Testament passage which he had in his eye, it is Pharaoh who hardens himself.[1]

Paul admits no valid contradiction between the universal scope of redemption, and the fact, already sufficiently clear, that the great majority of that people, whose origin, promises, and former privileges gave it a special call, remained shut out from Messiah's kingdom. Priding themselves on their descent and their legal works, the Jews were wont to regard salvation and its conditions as something that belonged of right to them, and to them alone. Hence their conclusion that Christ cannot be the true Messiah, nor faith in Him what God requires, for that would be shown in the unanimous and willing assent of the whole nation, which is clearly the very reverse of the fact. Paul's answer is twofold. First, it is not lineal descent, or belonging to a particular nation, that is the point; not all members of the Israelite people are Israelites in the higher spiritual sense of the word. Secondly, man's will and act has as little to do with the matter as bodily descent, but only the counsel of God, who foresaw all and directs all with a supreme wisdom and justice, inscrutable to us short-

[1] Exod. viii. 15—32.

sighted mortals. The apostle rests on that divine necessity which is not limited by our aims or acts, but by the eternal decree of God. It is God who fixes for nations, as for individuals, their eternal relations and condition, and their whole outward course of life, and in this sense chose Isaac before Ishmael, Jacob before Esau, and, from their children, the Israelites before the Edomites. But he leaves every one free to follow out his own nature; only it is not the particular outward acts, good or bad, but the foreseen motive and temper from which they spring, by which his decisions are ruled. The subtle intellect, which questions the why of God's dispensations for the position, circumstances, and conditions of life of individuals, is warned back by Paul to its proper limits, by the remark that the potter has power to mould of the clay what vessels he will for honour or for dishonour.[1] And so, indeed, to the question—why am I thus formed? thus gifted? thus placed?—every one can but answer, that it so pleased God, that he is a vessel formed by God to serve Him as His instrument, either in high and honourable matters, or in what seem small and are of no repute with men.

And so, according to Paul's expression, the Gospel to one is an odour of death unto death, to another of life unto life, and there are among men "vessels of wrath fitted to destruction," but only such because they would not become vessels of grace; and these God bears with patiently, partly to leave them time for conversion, partly that they may be instrumental to the good of others, as the obstinacy of the Jews is said to be a gain to the well-

[1] Rom. ix. 6—21.

disposed among the Gentiles. In one section of the Jews Paul saw vessels of wrath, but he shows that God has not yet rejected His people. It is in his thoughts, though he does not especially state it, that the conversion of the whole nation would rather have increased than lessened the difficulties of converting the Gentiles. But Israel is only for a time cast off, and only for its unbelief and faithlessness to the grace offered in Christ. The time will come, after the multitude of the Heathen are converted, when the hard-heartedness of Israel will cease, and the whole remnant of them be saved by coming into the kingdom of Messiah. The apostle never speaks of arbitrary divine decrees about the salvation or destruction of men, or of a divine predestination which fixes their belief or unbelief, their change of heart or hardening; on the contrary, he always assumes the freedom of the individual, and the responsibility of his actions. The Jews incurred their exclusion from Messiah's kingdom by their own unbelief, and the one will endure as long as the other. When Paul speaks of men being hardened by God, he is thinking of that state of superinduced stupidity and hopeless obduracy against truth and grace, which is the inevitable result of a chronic struggle against the force of divine warnings and the voice of conscience.[1]

[1] 2 Cor. ii. 14 sqq. Cf. 1 Cor. i. 18. Rom. ix., xi.

END OF VOL. I.

LEWIS AND SON, Printers, Swan Buildings, Moorgate Street.

00111634

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 19 September, 2016